

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XVI

OCTOBER, 1931

No. 4

EDITORIAL

A YEAR OR SO AGO WE WERE HEARING MUCH ABOUT HUMANISM, and for a time there was prospect that a new school of Humanists would arise to exert a marked influence upon the thinking, especially the religious thinking, of the times. But evidently the movement had not much depth of soil, since little is now heard of it. Its very name was a mistake, for this late artificial movement bears small resemblance to the Humanism of the fifteenth century, which was produced by the historic forces of its day and in turn became itself a creative power that has profoundly influenced later civilization.

But while it is hardly necessary to treat very seriously this late flare-up in rationalism, parading under a historic name, nevertheless it is a very appropriate occasion to examine into the meaning of *Humanism—New and Old*. This is just what Bishop Du Bose helps us to do, in a paper using this expression as a title. The whole subject of humanism is no doubt rather vague in many minds; but this lucid essay clears up such obvious questions as, Just what was the Humanism of the Renaissance period? How did it come to be? How did it in turn affect history? How does the present "Humanism" differ from it? What are the prospects of the latter?

All these points are most ably handled. Moreover,

aside from the particular purpose of the writer here, we have a very interesting and informing piece of historical writing.

The constructive relation of the early Humanism to the revival of letters, to the Reformation, to the Scriptures, to the church, and to the lives of important personages are all touched upon here. It has been somewhat difficult to define historic Humanism, but Bishop Du Bose is at least not far astray when he says: "It was a state of mind, an inward sense of the beauty, fitness, and abiding course of truth and the better human hope." Over against this he says that, "though the modern brand considers itself limited by nothing, it does not travel beyond the finger tips or the brain cortices. The discovery of any vital spiritual fact is, therefore, impossible to it."

WE MAKE A VAST MISTAKE IF WE WORRY ABOUT THE power of the Christian religion to survive all conditions that face it. Our concern should be directed toward those who meet it with hostility, indifference, confusion or false interpretation. But how are men to go about gaining an unshakable and infinitely satisfying assurance of the reality of religion? This Dr. Chown answers in *A Search for Reality in Religion*.

Beginning with a few words on the difference between certainty and reality, he goes on to "examine some impediments to a fruitful search for religious reality," and refers first to the "vacuum of conviction" in men's minds that has followed the war. The cataclysm, however, did not originate any question respecting God's relation to men, but it did intensify age-old questions of the kind and call forth innumerable attempts to answer them. In his own admirable endeavor here, Dr. Chown

justifies his announced desire "not to offend the intellect of the scholar while satisfying the soul of the saint."

Although this is a brief paper for so profound a theme, it touches thoughtfully and forcefully the necessity of the idea of God, active and "neglective" atheism, the failure of philosophy and even theology to satisfy, quasi Christianity, the aim of the church, and the vital necessity of spiritual perception. The whole argument leads to the conclusion that reality can be found only as man's inherent moral intuition enables him to grasp the truth as it is in Jesus, revealed in the Bible, and "stamped upon the soul with reality and power" by the Spirit.

Before closing Dr. Chown has some very practical things to say about the theological seminaries and the place the Bible should have in them.

THERE IS NO BOOK OF THE BIBLE WHICH INDUCES SO many efforts at exposition as the Revelation of John. The reason is that the book has two unfailing elements of fascination, the predictive and the mystical. Anything that promises a glimpse into the future, especially if associated with one's religion, is sufficient of itself to hold attention; and this attraction is intensified when there is added the appeal to the imagination that lies in veiled and cryptic language.

As a result commentators upon the Revelation, good, bad, and indifferent, almost invariably devote themselves to interpretations of references to future events. But, whatever may be said of the Apocalypse as a prophetic book, it has also a strong spiritual element, and it is to this that Dr. McKnight chiefly devotes himself in *The Letter to the Laodiceans*. This has been newly written for these pages, and is not lifted from the

author's recent book on the letters to the seven churches, though covering much the same ground as the section therein upon the Laodicean letter.

The treatment is such as to present the Laodicean church as a concrete historical entity face to face with a world not friendly to its Lord. This has always meant for the individual spiritual dangers, and for the church problems of discipline. Dr. McKnight brings out these things, and incidentally furnishes suggestions for some strong sermons for these days. It is clear that the disposition of many expositors to regard the Laodicean letter as a picture of the church in our own day is not very wide of the mark.

THE WRITING OF HISTORY HAS BEEN UNDERGOING A marked change in character during recent decades. Whereas it used to be chiefly chronological, it is now analytical. The old style history was a rather tedious record of events and dates, or a dramatic recital of wars and conquests and discoveries, with the rise and fall of monarchs and nations.

But we have come to a better time for this great study. Now the historian seeks out the forces that have acted upon collective mankind, the occasions that have brought these forces into action, and the results. We have an example of this new type of history in Dr. Wentz' fine paper, *Permanent Deposits of Colonialism in American Christianity*.

Probably most of us, not being specialists in history, have failed to realize how large was the part played by religion in that great drama enacted during the three centuries following the discovery of America and commonly called the colonization of the Western Hemis-

phere. But here we are shown how dominant was the religious motive—as men of that day understood religion—in our early discoverers, explorers, and colonizers. Their characteristic responses to that motive by Spanish, French, and English pioneers are pointed out, with the modifications and the results that New World conditions imposed.

The forces that entered into American colonization have left certain permanent deposits in our Christianity, distinguishing it from Old World forms and outworn views, and giving the faith a renewed effectiveness. We need not here anticipate the author's discussion by outlining these deposits; but we may assure the reader that Dr. Wentz has made a distinct contribution to the average intelligent reader's understanding of our colonial period in relation to the progress of the Kingdom.

The question is, How should our American churches, with so rich an inheritance, respond to the spiritual needs of mankind?

THE ZEALOUS AND HIGHLY SYSTEMATIZED PROPAGANDA employed by certain non-Christian, un-Christian, and even anti-Christian bodies should in many cases put to shame the often lagging efforts of the church of Christ. The Mormon organization, for example, could never spread to any great extent on the merits of its teachings alone, but its well organized missionary activities among credulous people of little or no Christian background are more or less fruitful.

About two years ago Dr. Paden contributed to these pages an article on the changing and unchanged elements in Mormonism, which dealt chiefly with the religious doctrines of the organization. In this issue the

same writer, who is synodical executive, Synod of Utah, National Missions Committee of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., describes *The Missionary Work of the Mormons*. After showing how recruits were gained in the early days of Mormonism, he describes the methods in use today.

Several things strike the reader as oddly inconsistent with what he commonly thinks of as missionary work, such as the disposition to avoid efforts among the heathen while seeking proselytes among poorly instructed or lukewarm Christians, and also the distinctly unspiritual character of various missionaries. An important point is that half or more of Mormon missionary effort is confined to our own country.

The preacher who reads this paper may have no more than a curious interest in its contents, but Mormon agents are aggressively busy in many communities, and may confuse the minds and disturb the faith of members of his own congregation before he is aware of it. It is with a view to forearm against invasions of this kind that we gladly open the quarterly to contributors who are well informed on such subjects.

SINCE EXEGESIS IS OF FIRST IMPORTANCE, NOT ONLY FOR grasping the meaning of a passage, but for feeling its full force and getting its more subtle allusions, we believe our ministerial readers welcome all fresh material of this character. It is for this reason we are maintaining this department.

In the present number we have a study of a passage in Amos, under the caption, *The Responsibility of Privilege*, written by Professor Osborn; also a brief study of *Hebrews 4:11-13*, by Dr. Kuist.

THESE BOOKS DO NOT MAKE A LONG LIST, BUT THEY are of sufficient interest and importance to merit the space devoted to their reviews:

The Book of Isaiah: Chapters I-XXXIX.—Boutflower.

The Reform Movement in Judaism.—Philipson.

Karl Barth's Theology.—Hoyle.

What Do We Mean By God?—Valentine.

The Origin and Growth of Religion.—Schmidt.

The History of Fundamentalism.—Cole.

R. M. K.

HUMANISM—NEW AND OLD

By BISHOP H. M. DU BOSE

WITH THE EARLY RENAISSANCE, and specifically in Florence in the general age of Lorenzo the Magnificent, the word *humanism* came into use, with a determinative significance. The culture ideals for which it stood held with compelling sway through the whole of the fifteenth century. Traveling into Western Europe with the revival of letters, Humanism became, in no small degree, a promotive force of the Reformation. Indeed, it may be regarded as the nascent *protest* against medieval ecclesiasticism and theology, as it also was a revulsion from those lifeless literary forms and abnormities which clothed themselves in the decadent Latin of the cloister and the ritual. Dante in the *Divina Comedia* and Petrarch in his *Sonnets* and other poetic essays created an Italian speech of grammatical consistencies and harmonies which, though it was not to become the *via media* to the goal of Humanism, was to lead to a wicket gate through which Humanist scholars were to reach the treasure strewn fields of Attica and to come into a perfect heritage in the recovered Greek New Testament and the manuscripts of the Greek masters.

Not all Humanists were saints; some were not even Theists; and not a few became materialists, not only as to their intellectual creed, but also as to their habits of appetency and indulgence. Some great scholars of the age expressed the fear that Humanism might end in paganism; but on the whole it was able to give a better

account of its motives and influences. There were Humanists and Humanists, as there were priests and priests; and, alas, it must be admitted, the attitude of each class was about the same toward the behests of true religion. As with the theology of the age, Humanism must be judged from the average of its promoters and their purposes.

Petrarch and Martin Luther stood at the complementing extremes of the Renaissance-Reformation cycle. Petrarch, by historic consent the first of the Humanists, infused into Italian literature a spirit which widened its impulsions until they ushered in the day when Chalcondylas and his fellow Greeks brought the language of Plato and Pericles to the schools of Italy. Correspondingly, when the ecclesiastical controversy over the sale of indulgences had reached its climax, and when his faith had been answered by a new spiritual illumination from the privately interpreted Scriptures, Martin Luther became the embodiment of the two lines of protest which eventually found expression in the fact and articles of Protestantism. The revival of letters and the revival of religion were the output of one profoundly intellectual and profoundly spiritual original. This was the humanizing of thought and literature on the basis of faith in the written Word and in those impulses of humanity according therewith. This definition applies, so far as the age of the De Medicis admitted of spirituality, to the Humanism of the Florentine school in general. No tenet of early Humanism either rejected or qualified the truth of revelation. In spite of its opposition to the hierarchy, which sought to defend its own abuses by appeals to falsely interpreted Scripture, Humanism, in the main, cherished both the letter and the spirit of the Word in a way that helped

to bring its triumph. Humanism was theology in holiday attire. It was belief not quite come to the portals of faith.

Savonarola, though we know him as having been at uncompromising enmity with the sins of Lorenzo and his court, must be thought of as a Humanist, certainly in the sense of the best that Humanism implied. In his interpretation of Scripture he showed that the church triumphant was but little reflected in the church militant as it existed before his eyes; and this at a time when he was master of the thought and, to an extent, of the material fortunes of the Florentines and their schools. Perhaps the candor of Savonarola was shared by every true Humanist in Florence and its intellectual tributaries, only the courage of the monk being absent from their processes.

There will be found no better way to sum up the values of historic Humanism than by referring to the experience of Lorenzo himself. In the glory that was Florence during the brilliant day of his rule Lorenzo was hailed as chief of the Humanists; and this renown was no empty boast. Of all the masters who gathered at his court none surpassed him in the love of art and learning, and few were his equal in clearness of knowledge and understanding. He instructed the wisest, and entranced the most brilliant, of his proteges. But for his personality and influence the history of Europe for the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries had been far different from that which is written. This observation applies equally to the literature, religion, and general humanity content of the history of this period; so much may one man become in the general sum of life.

When admonished of his approaching end Lorenzo sent for Savonarola, against whom he had held a grudge

because of his many reproofs. Though he disrelished the memory of these corrections, he believed in the piety of the monk and from him sought consolation in his dying hour. Historians are much at odds as to the nature and outcome of this interview. The followers of Savonarola are, however, united in the report that it was marked by genuine religious submission on the part of the Humanist ruler. Benedetto, writing some time after Lorenzo's death, says of his end: "Our dear friend and master died so nobly, with all the patience, the reverence, the recognition of God which the best of holy men and a soul divine could show, with words upon his lips so kind, that he seemed a new St. Jerome."

In his earlier years Lorenzo had been reported as saying: "If I believe aught implicitly, I believe in Plato's doctrine of immortality in the *Phaedo*, for religion is too much a matter of temperament to lay down hard and fast rules about it." In this earlier attitude he was the true Humanist; in the latter he was no less so, but more the historic Catholic. In his last moments he received the rites of the church, knelt for the *viaticum*, and repeated the responses of the ritual. While pressing a crucifix to his lips he entered the mystery of the beyond. A modern historian says of him: "As a humanist he had been reared, as a humanist he lived and labored, and as a humanist he died, maintaining to the very last his interest in those studies which it had been his life passion to pursue." This recital gives a fair understanding of the Humanism of Florence toward the close of the fifteenth century.

In the German states Erasmus was accepted as the typical Humanist; while in England Colet, Linacre, Gorceyn, and Sir Thomas More gave lively expression to the ideals of the Florentine school. Although Eras-

mus and More were never reckoned with the Reformers, their contentions for the freedom of the literary spirit and for the divorcement of philosophy from ecclesiastical pragmatism stimulated the scholars of the Reformation to push the claims of faith into the same realm into which the Humanists had carried reason and culture. Reuchlin and Melancthon were scarcely less Humanistic than Erasmus and More; but they were much more logical, in that they carried their convictions to a complete break with medieval ecclesiasticism and theology. With life, as it were, saturated with the new learning, yet holding with passionate loyalty to the written Word, these scholars of the Reformation were more than a match for the doctors and cardinals of Rome.

Humanism, like many other movements involving the ethics of thought and faith, never went into a distinct statement. It had no Athanasius. It was a state of mind, an inward sense of the beauty, fitness, and abiding course of truth and the better human hope. Logically, though half unconsciously, this confluent mental state affected the choices and habits of a wide fellowship whose only bond was loyalty to classic ideal. That ideal was variant and manifold, but returned at last to the centrality of the white light which beat upon the throne of the De Medici. Music, sculpture, painting, poetry, philosophy, architecture, and learning were interpreted to fit into the religious sense and to be adjuncts of the sway of religion over the mind and emotions, when religion was put into proper statement. Though the average Humanist of Florence knew it not, that statement, and largely by leave of their own thought departure, was in the soul convictions and men-

tal processes of a monk who brought together the tangled ends of the world's thought and desire.

It was at first not the undue exaltation of either the human sense, the intellect or the humanities, as represented in the various forms of classic culture and learning, that suggested *humanism* as a term to describe the new intellectual engagement; but rather the claim that both revelation and the dispensations of thought are addressed to, and inclusive of, humanity as being a whole in itself. As a corollary of this it was held that revelation, both of the divine approach and of the intellectual response, in forms of faith and culture, must interpret humanity to itself. This the church and the theology of medievalism did not do; and so the Humanists, for the most part, walked in a course that stopped only short of the point of open rupture with papal doctrine and authority. Naturally one sees that this situation anticipated the Reformation, as one also sees that its spirit was never in revolt against revealed religion or ever anticipated denial of its claims.

But the Humanistic situation at Florence early went beyond mere passivity. The autonomy of the De Medicean rule reassured the Humanist leaders, and the name actually became the designation of a political faction which supported Lorenzo in his military contentions with the papacy. This, with many other surface indications, makes it a matter of wonder that Florence rather than Germany had not become the birthland of the Reformation. The reason is to be sought for in racial instincts and temperaments. It is the difference between Nordic and Latin blood. Italy could produce a St. Francis d'Assisi, but not a Martin Luther. Centuries of Roman imperialism had left the Latin mind repressed within the limits of an impelling subordina-

tion. Attempts at protest and reform in the Peninsula have been fitful and short-lived; but the wildness and freedom of the German forests produced a boldness and courage in the northern race that leaped to the demands of faith and history.

But a high value is put upon Florentine Humanism when it is recognized as making an even indirect contribution to those forces which brought on the Reformation and determined its course. However, the radical causes of Luther's theological revolt ranged deeper than the levels of Florentine culture, deeper than any collateral movement of the century. It was of the logic of history and the letter of the divine Word. Yet it was the development of culture that precipitated the ecclesiastical crisis, and lighted the Reformers on their way to Augsburg and to the formulation of the Protestant Confession.

Protestantism, when it emerged from the controversies and strifes which beset its nascent period, so completely embodied the larger ideals of early Humanism and so completely provided for their perpetuation, that no formula was shaped for it, either as a quality of learning or as a method of religion. This also explains why Humanism slowly faded, as does the morning star, into the kindred light of the larger day. With a new century, the name all but ceased to be used outside the circles of the classicists and the students of the older literatures. However, in all periods subsequent to the De Medicean age, and prior to the middle of the last century, there have been groups of artists, sculptors, painters, philosophers, and literary men, as also leaders in theology, who have not held it an unworthy thing to think of themselves as Humanists. Ben Jonson, Lord Bacon, Shakespeare, Pope, Addison, Steele, Carlyle,

and even Tennyson were self-accounted Humanists, though no book of remembrance in testimony thereof was kept in their generations. With even the last of these there was no dream of the deflated values to which the noble coinage of the Florentine Humanists was to be reduced. That is a somewhat sinister and altogether confusing performance in the foggy intellectualism of the present day.

This leads us to undertake a more definite assessment of the original and developed meaning of Humanism until it passed into the radical transition of a modernistic impressment. A satisfactory summary of classic Humanism shows it to be the middle voice, so to speak, of three classifications of knowledge—the knowledge of humanity, the knowledge of that which is above humanity, and of that which is below humanity. But the classic Humanists did not confine knowledge to the middle member of this tripartite metaphysics; they made humanity only the vantage from which to survey and determine the facts of the lower and the verities of the higher. To be sure, the Humanist did not pursue the study of metallurgy and chemistry with the same assiduity as he cultivated painting, history, philosophy, and poetry. Nor did he when he entered the field of theology leave behind him the human consciousness into which he had emptied the treasures of Humanistic art and culture. It was this that made the classic Humanist appear to history as a reformer and saint, but to the papal *Index Expurgatorius* as a pagan and a heretic.

I trust I shall be able, when we reach the determinative point in this paper, to show that the modern interpretation of Humanism is a complete reversal of its older statement. It is a case of the parasitic ichneumon and the butterfly, a clear and isolated example of trans-

migration. Indeed, amazement increases when one comes to realize what manner of license has been taken in levying upon the terms and associations of classic Humanism. This license not only does injustice to a historic attitude of the human intellect; but it also dishonestly confuses the lay studentship of an age already distressed through the complications of criticism. But this situation was not reached at a bound; it has been a slow development toward a sinister conclusion, if this implication be not too strongly put; but, in verity, some sort of stricture is due to be assessed against an act so palpably unjust to traditional thought.

At a time historically remote men speculated concerning, and allowed as legitimate, a statement of Theistic Humanism; but these were terms which well comport with the best of fifteenth and sixteenth century thought, and were also acceptable to the conservative attitudes of the present day. But sometimes terminologies are ensnaring to both intellect and faith. That is a fact in evidence in the case of modern Humanism. I venture to assert that the overplus of critical and philosophical difficulties which vexes the faith of today is to be accounted for in the multiplication of needless and obscur-ing terms. Certainly this began to be true when men sought to qualify the theology of the Supreme Existence by bringing to bear upon it the demands of a so-called Humanistic philosophy, the sequestered middle voice, leaving off, on the one hand, the challenge of nature, and, on the other, the claims of the divine revelation. This is nominalism parading under a more honorable name.

There is a calendar of the intellect whose seasons are favorable to the springing of particular names and methods of thought construction, a tide in the movement

of the occult and in the human response thereto. It is fortunate for Christianity that the Nicene articles on the Godhood came before the Renaissance and the Reformation. With even their healthy leads into anthropology, these articles barely pre-empted the place which was made for them in history. Neither the medieval church, nor its papal successions, nor yet Protestantism, could have written the article on the Trinity nor the *homoousian* discourse on the Son. It is the set time and the set conjunction that make such concepts and their expression possible. It was not a matter of operative intellect, nor of a peculiar temporal mood of humanity, that sponsored the Nicene writing, but rather an order and logic of the truth itself, which sets in place that last for which the first was made. Revelation has had its day and place, and cannot be repeated; so the historic interpretation of Christian theology found its voice, once for all. This is not the disfranchising of human intellect in any period of time; it is only the linking up of the things of life and thought in their proper succession. Humanism had its day, and can have none other.

Theistic Humanism, properly so described, came logically with the breaking down of medieval theology. It was the half-way house to an evangelical awakening. With that awakening both its teachings and its terms were covered into the general thought and consciousness of Christianity. It was only as the adventurous drew these terms out and devoted them to speculative uses that a history of confusion began. Theistic Humanism, when its terms were unduly stressed, became Humanistic Theism. Deistic Humanism followed as the rationalistic tendencies in philosophy multiplied. When art,

learning, and science seemed to demand the doctrine of a humanity-centered world, and of a syllogism with man as the major premise, Deism was the conclusion, Deism ever gravitating toward that form of subjectivism modernly miscalled Humanism. The eighteenth century Deists, as Rousseau and Voltaire in France, Bolingbroke and Hume in the British Isles, and Jefferson and others in America, counted themselves Humanists; but they were such in retrograde. Their doctrine led to nineteenth century agnosticism, and this to a covert atheism, which has been reached in a day whose radical would-be leaders vainly suppose themselves to be Humanists.

A book written by a distinguished Jewish rabbi, A. H. Silver, and recently from the press, has for its all but opening sentence the following: "Never was liberal theology in such a mortal funk as it is today. It has finally come face to face with its real foe—the Apollyon of materialism, agnosticism and atheism." The collective sense of all this is that which is sought to be described in the term whose unwarranted use we are now animadverting upon. But this debacle is not the result of Humanism, justly considered from any angle of its derivation or definition. It is rationalism, and that often confined within the limits of behavioristic self-sufficiency. It is not evolution, but revolution, and that with the result of distinct disaster.

It should be the reproach of the leaders of so-called liberal Christian theology that they must have the mortal weakness of their position pointed out by an Israelite. This enlightened and serious minded leader of Judaism sees clearly the goal to which his liberal Christian contemporaries are driving. He has uttered a warning. It is, however, not for him to indicate the way

out. He is a Theist and a race religionist. His ends and those of his race brethren are served in affirming their historic Theism; but his Christian allies, through the tergiversations of their reasoning, have lost their Christ and have become something less than Theists. No wonder they have floundered in the selection of a name. A precedent of history has been invoked, and under its impressed patronage the forces of modernistic skepticism have rallied for a new stand.

But it has gravely been suggested that modernistic Humanism is a flare-up and destined to be short-lived. For good reasons this well can be wished; for equally good reasons it can be believed. Over and above the fact that it is a misnomer, it is a cumberer of the ground. A persistent effort has been made to put it on a parity with Theism as a discussional value. In the nature of things the effort has been, and must continue to be, abortive. Any form of Humanism considered apart from Theism has no theological value. With all its boast of intellect, emotion, and ethical self-sufficiency, naked Humanism leaves the race stranded and helpless. All that it can signify is expressed in physiology, psychology, and social science; and these lie in a field which classic Humanism either passed by or treated as subsidiary to its main theses, art, learning, and the larger freedom of the intellect, limited only by the transcendence of revelation. But though the modern brand considers itself limited by nothing, it does not travel beyond the finger tips or the brain cortices. The discovery of any vital spiritual fact is, therefore, impossible to it.

To be sure, the religious tenet in classic Humanism was individualistic and without written statement. Nevertheless it was elemental; and, as we have seen, be-

came one of the determinative antecedents of the Reformation. So it is clear that the innovation, judged by its self-evaluated content, has no standing that can be maintained. Theology it is not, nor even natural religion. Whatever trend it may have toward science is already anticipated in established categories. It came from nowhere; it is bound no whither. It is quixotic and impossible.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

A SEARCH FOR REALITY IN RELIGION

By S. D. CHOWN, D.D., LL.D.

THE SEARCH attempted in this article is guided by a desire not to offend the intellect of the scholar while satisfying the soul of the saint. So far as possible it must carry certainty of conviction, since the absence of that quality always paralyzes progress.

Certainty and reality are two different conceptions. The first is subjective and implies sureness of conviction. The second is related to the matter about which conviction is sought. Both ideas will mingle in the following discussion. It should also be clearly recognized that our search is for reality in *religion*, and is not by any means to be confused with a search for truth expressed in creeds.

We shall first examine some impediments to a fruitful search for religious reality, arising out of facts and conditions in contemporary life and literature. The vast disillusionment consequent upon the World War created in many minds a vacuum of conviction concerning life problems of profound importance. Of these problems one that beats about the mentality of thousands of people is related to the moral government of the world. These puzzled people ask a decision as to whether the Divine Being could or could not have prevented the wanton slaughter of millions of people, the gigantic wastage of the world's material resources, and the topsyturvydom of life in many aspects and in numerous portions of the earth. If He could not have prevented the war (since He did not), it has been

reasoned that He must be morally irresponsible; and upon this assumption the further question has arisen: Should mankind be held responsible to such an irresponsible God?

On the other hand, if the Divine Being were not really competent to prevent such a cataclysm of destruction another question has been brought to the fore: Why should He be held in reverence as the moral governor of mankind?

In the mental predicament occasioned by the war many have sought surcease of perplexity by permitting themselves to drift into atheism or the complete denial of the existence of the Divine Being. This relief has been accepted notwithstanding the contemporary assurance of foremost scholars that modern science is justifying a new grip upon God as the Creator and the sustainer of the universe. Scientists now declare that we are as truly compelled to assume a Maker's mind to account for a rational world as we are forced to postulate an author's mind to account for rational literature. The situation is a call to return to the teleological argument for the divine existence, and to confess that the adaptation of means to ends indicates intelligent purpose as clearly as does the fitting of a million keys to open a million different locks.

The universe cannot rationally be conceived of as a gigantic accident resulting from an infinite succession of happy flukes. B. H. Streeter declares that "Of all the strange beliefs that man has cherished none flaunts a paradox so staggering as this." Recent discoveries in physics and astronomy emphatically confirm belief in a Creator acting upon the universe in the capacity of a transcendently profound mathematician. If the saying, "An undevout astronomer is mad," had significance in

an earlier day, how much more impressive it has become since Sir James Jeans, a leader in the present scientific revolution, assures us that "It has been discovered that the sun is a million times larger than our earth, and that some stars are millions of times larger than the sun, and that the total number of the stars is about equal of the number of raindrops that fall over the whole of London during a day of heavy rain." The number of the stars is now estimated to be about thirty thousand millions, or twenty stars to every individual person of the world's population today. From the astronomical point of view the madness must be theirs who deny the creatorship of Him whom we devoutly call God.

Then, when attention is turned from a vastness which transcends human imagination to the incomprehensibly minute organisms in creation, some of which are said to be so diminutive that they are capable of rushing in numbers through the eye of a needle without jostling one another, there is in this a very different but equally strong suggestion of the activity in creation of an infinite personal intelligence.

The profundities of physics as well as the immensities of astronomy, both of which could be illustrated almost *ad infinitum*, combine to awaken in the writer's memory a remarkable saying of Jean Paul Richter, which runs something as follows: I will go no further, for the heart of man acheth with this infinity. Insufferable is the glory of God. Let me die in the grave and hide me from the persecution of the Infinite, for end I see there is none.

Not only the heart, but the head of man acheth with this infinity. To make a serious attempt to imagine it reduces an ordinary mind to despair and stupefaction. How can we rise to the height of the great argument of

the Psalmist when in a flood of supernal eloquence he says: "When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers [as though God had easily sprayed the constellations from his finger tips], what is man [in his littleness and inability] that thou shouldst magnify him, or the son of man that thou shouldst set thy heart upon him?" Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God by His mighty works made foolish the wisdom of the atheist?

Since by common consent religion is the tie that binds man to the Deity, it is certain that the atheist can lend no assistance in the search for its reality. By his own premises he debars himself. The acceptance of atheism cataracts the spiritual eye and blanks the search for reality. The atheist must confess, 'It is not in me to find it.'

A special angle in which a negative atheism asserts itself and affects a superior type of mind is interestingly illustrated in the life and writings of Mr. Bertrand Russell. He is typical of a class of students who, owing to the domination of other obsessions, are incapable of establishing a favorable point of contact with Jesus Christ. Bertrand Russell explains that he has no hostility to moral rules, his real "attitude to life being expressed by St. Paul in the famous passage on charity." Yet by a strange perversity of vision he imagines that the happiness of mankind would be augmented by the destruction of organized religion. He appears to be unaware of the sunshine which religion pours into life and of its stabilizing and uplifting power in every department of human existence. In a recent exposition of himself he declared his belief that "a healthy psychology and good international government are sufficient factors

for the happy development of mankind." Here he appears unconsciously to link himself to some objectives of the Christian churches, though these purposes are not stated by them in exactly similar terms.

The Divine Being, however, is left on one side. What of devotion remains possible in his philosophy is centered upon a self-conceived humanism whose shrine is the work of his own mind. It may possibly touch the fringe of Deism, but it leaves the heart cold towards a God whom man can love, and who enters into personal relationship with all who seek and find Him. There appears, therefore, to be little, if any, more incentive in his teaching toward a search for reality in religion than appears in crude, unexplained, unstudied, and unadulterated atheism. This negative, or neglective, atheism is not only the most prevalent but also the most dangerous which besets the world.

In this search for reality in religion the question naturally arises as to how far philosophy, regarded as a science, may render assistance. Within the Christian era the primary application of philosophy was to theology with a view of commending it to reason. Through that medium philosophy impinged upon the sphere of religion. At times since then idealistic philosophy has illumined human thought with broad canopies of light. Its sentiments concerning the divine existence have been gathered into the music of Wordsworth's well known poem:

Something

Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean, and the living air,
And the blue sky, and the mind of man;
A motion and a spirit, which impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought
And rolls through all things.

Immanuel Kant may stand for those philosophers who have contributed to a sense of moral obligation. Although at one time he spoke of metaphysics as a dark ocean without shores or lighthouses, strewn with many a philosophic wreck, by his insistence upon the categorical imperative he bore witness to a moral law, and by inference to a Lawgiver.

But speaking generally of modern philosophy, it must be said that, while it may rationalize theology, it cannot beget spiritual religion. In respect to the assumption that it can supply sufficient spiritual content to displace religion, it may be said that it merits the description given by Thomas Carlyle of political economy as a "dismal science." In some aspects it may carry a semblance of religious reality on account of the light reflected upon it from the borderland of religion; but it never reaches the heart of the subject. By action and counteraction one upon another its various schools have clarified truths of intellectual value; but by its contradictions and its habit of returning upon itself in the course of history it must consent to the description of Professor John Dewey when he says that "upon their surface the reports of the world which form our different philosophies are various to the point of stark contrariness."

It is to be noted that "the whole temper of the modern intellect" radiates mystery into many truths which are perfectly clear to participants of the abundant life which Jesus came to impart. One effect of the process of formal logic is that it devitalizes the spiritual, or what is sometimes called the supersense, which is a fundamental attribute of true religion. The emotional intensity which is germane to communion with the

Eternal is often smothered under heaps of scholastic verbalism.

The effort now being made by quasi-Christian apologists to placate the modern mood is submerging reason itself. It emasculates any rational conception of the Almighty when it describes Him as consisting of "one's better self," and of "all that is best in human nature," and as "a vast cosmic drift toward harmony, fellowship and mutual aid in creating a just equilibrium in human affairs." Just as God is infinitely more than all the powers and potencies lodged in the physical universe, so He is infinitely more than all the humanistic conceptions usurping the place of an infinite and eternal creative Personality.

We are assured by certain modern teachers who would decimate the Deity by a few strokes of the pen, that the God we know cannot possibly be the real God, but only an abstract cross section of the real God. That is not startling. Each human being can see only his personal cross section of any object of perception. The older theologians admitted something of the sort, but claimed that their apprehension of the Divine Being, so far as it went, was that of the real God. They admitted, however, that since He was infinite they could not *comprehend* Him. Nor does a Christian believer "create his own God." His "humanism," so called, is not an evolution from his own mind, but a reflection of the tenderness of the eternal Father as revealed in the Scriptures and exemplified in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ.

The aim of the church of Christ is not to follow various fashions of thought, but to penetrate the fabric of society with faith in the abiding truth of the Word of God. It is not to keep its ear to the ground for

human voices, but to open its heart for the inspiration of the Divine Spirit. A permanent distinction between philosophy and religion is, that while in the progress of thought the former will change its substance, the word of our God shall stand forever. It is not remarkable that with all his profound learning Blaise Pascal should exclaim, "Give me the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and not the God of the philosophers."

A distinctive quality of religious knowledge is that it rests upon an immediate consciousness of God as spirit, light, and love. These imponderables have a power of directly permeating the spirit of man, and they at once accredit themselves to Christian consciousness. In this realm, therefore, the idea of a peasant is of equal certainty with the theory of a philosopher. In fact, true philosophy is the explication of the common mind.

God has not left Himself without witness in the soul of man. Music, art, duty, friendship, heroism, and conscience are all open windows through which he catches glimpses of divine reality. Through them also comes the dawning of that consciousness immortalized by Saint Augustine in the words so often quoted, "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless until they find rest in Thee."

Sitting in the solitudes of the primeval forest or gazing upward to the starry heavens, there falls upon the normal man a sense of the Infinite Presence. The pressure of universal nature expands and deepens that feeling. There is a logic of the heart as well as of the head, and it tells us that

There is no tree that rears its crest,
No fern or flower that cleaves the sod,
No bird that sings above its nest,
But tries to speak the name of God
And dies when it has done its best.

The great literatures of the world which have survived the wear of the centuries also bear witness. They are instinct with problems which culminate in man's relation to Deity.

Rising above the testimony of nature and literature, and passing through the gate which in the Scriptures is termed conversion, a new relation is entered into between God and man, time and eternity, and one becomes possessed of a type of experience hitherto by him unknown. It is an experience which removes all moral contradictions in a life of spiritual unity and reality, and points onward to the solution of life's problems through the continuous acceptance of the teaching and friendship of Jesus. To the faithful disciple the new experience reveals the utmost meaning of life, and raises the spirit of comradeship with Jesus to its highest power.

Alfred Lord Tennyson bears witness to the reality of conversion in his *Idyll of the King* entitled *Geraint and Enid*. The good King Arthur is conversing with Geraint, one of the knights of his Round Table, about Edyrn, another of his knights, who has been converted from a life of wicked abandonment amidst an environment of turbulent iniquity, and says to him:

Have ye looked at Edyrn?
 Have ye seen how nobly changed?
 This work of his is great and wonderful.
 His very face with change of heart is changed.
 The world will not believe a man repents;
 And this wise world of ours is mainly right.
 Full seldom doth a man repent, or use
 Both grace and will to pick the vicious quitch
 Of blood and custom wholly out of him,
 And make all clean and plant himself afresh.
 Edyrn hath done it, weeding all his heart,
 As I will weed this land before I go.

Aided by the Spirit of God, Edyrn had plucked the weeds of sin from his heart, and they had been consumed in the fire of divine love. That is true conversion.

Mr. H. G. Wells, in one of his better moods, testifies in prose to results following conversion similar to those described by Tennyson. He witnesses that "God comes to us within and takes us for His own. He releases us from ourselves; He incorporates us with His own undying experience and adventure; He receives us and gives *Himself*. He is a stimulant; He makes us live immortally and more abundantly. I have compared Him to the sensation of a dear strong friend, who comes and stands quietly beside one, shoulder to shoulder." This experience is not due to magic or superstition. It is a personal relation to God which comes to every sincere seeker through prayer, surrender, and faith. It is not an antiquated theory, but a fresh experience in this as in all other centuries.

But a short time ago the writer was associated with a celebrated American poet, who, without any tinge of stilted piety or suggestion of mock heroism but simply in conversation between man and man, said: "You may cut my heart right away through and you will find Jesus at the center. I am all for Him and He is everything to me." A life of noble philanthropy attests the sincerity of that testimony.

We venture another illustration of the fruit of conversion. The governor of the prison in which Nurse Edith Cavell was confined before being led out to her execution said afterwards that he "expected to see a downcast sobbing woman, but instead of that the victim came out with head erect, and with a look of radiant happiness upon her face. Before I knew it," said the governor, "I was sobbing myself, and the men around

me, and the German soldiers. I said to myself, 'Surely there is a God who can give this woman such courage,' and since then I have never ceased to believe in a Supreme Power."

A consistent life of religious reality even develops an experience similar to that of St. Paul when he said, "I am crucified with Christ. Nevertheless I live, yet not I; Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me."

The evolutionist, Arthur Russell Wallace, reached the thrilling conclusion that "it is the influx of the divine life that makes us men." This expresses the highest rung in the ladder of evolution in this world. It also sets forth with its many implications the highest rung in the ladder of religious reality. "Life is the mystery of God flowing into the mystery of man." The completeness of any human character is due to an inbreathing of God Himself. Real religion is an expression of the life of God in the soul of a man. If this is lacking, the essence and the power, the reality and the glory, of religion are absent, and the effort to live a Christian life is reduced to a matter of difficult imitation.

At this point we reach a tremendously important question: Are the theological seminaries, by presenting religious reality, preparing their students for the splendid task of preaching the full-orbed religion of Jesus Christ? It must be confessed, in the spirit of perfect sympathy with what are called the pulpit problems of the modern day, that in many instances the quality of tentativeness rather than of testimony is observable in the pulpit. The negative effect of this upon life is almost equal to declared skepticism. An experienced minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church in New

York says: "The great difficulty with college men is to get them to understand what is meant by religious experience." He says they have not any concept in their minds that remotely corresponds to his conception of salvation. It follows that if there be no experience of salvation, there can be no testimony to it; and if no testimony, there cannot really be a saving propaganda. True preaching is always impregnated with testimony in the Holy Spirit.

It was said of Bishop Hannington that, whatever faults he may have had, preaching beyond his experience was not one of them. "He never dealt in the false commerce of a truth unfelt." John Bunyan said: "I preached what I did feel—what I smartingly did feel."

The comparative absence of that measure of conviction today is partly due to the fact that too large a part of the seminary curriculum appears to be directed towards enabling the student to use "the modern scalpels of psychology, sociology, criticism and the like." The aim seems to be to aid the student to stand in the foremost files of thought rather than to move in the deepest grooves of spirituality. The intellectualizing of the curriculum has in many cases evaporated its spiritual purpose. The criterion of fitness for the ministry has strayed away from an earlier and truer realism. The most important problem of the theological seminary is to recover the conviction of authority with which the Bible was preached by former generations. While many today have discarded the view that Biblical authority must be founded upon belief in verbal inspiration, they nevertheless still regard the Bible as a lantern within which is carried all truth "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," and from which there shines into the minds of

all sincere seekers after truth the Gospel of the Son of God.

The basic authority for essential truth is found in the intuitions that are inherent in man's moral constitution. By the inspiration of the Spirit of God the truths which make for salvation are stamped upon the soul with reality and power in the experience of conversion. Their authority increases in proportion to obedience to the will of God. Every upward climb upon the hills of duty reveals with greater clearness the high mountains of truth and obligation. "He that wills to do the will of God shall have the teaching of God." The final sanction of divine authority inheres in the fruit of holiness experienced in the individual and observable in social and public life. By its fruit the truth shall be known. The joint agency of these tests of truth, if honestly accepted, will convey an unwavering faith in the authority of the Bible in respect to all the purposes for which it was inspired.

The saying of Jesus, "I am the truth," makes Himself the center of all Christian preaching. It follows that when the truth as it is in Jesus is preached, Christ is preached; and when Christ is preached, the truth is preached. In the use of the word truth Jesus does not simply mean conformity to fact. His meaning is much deeper and more essential. When Jesus said, "I am the truth," "He that is of the truth heareth my words," He meant a spiritual essence within His life and words which has power to transform character. It has the same relation to the form as the spirit has to the body of man. The words that He speaks are spirit and are life.

Modern science tells us that matter is electricity. It is a matter of common experience among devout read-

ers of the Bible that truth touches the heart as with a live wire. As they read the Bible they are often "stung with the splendor of a sudden thought." If this essential truth is the spiritual coin of the pulpit, it follows that the Bible, which pre-eminently contains it, should have precedence over all other subjects in the curricula of Biblical seminaries. It must be made a familiar and open book.

If the real religion of Jesus Christ were preached, practiced, and professed by all who are nominally Christians, the glory of the world would soon surpass the most glowing descriptions of any Utopia ever conceived by the mind of man.

TORONTO, CANADA.

THE LETTER TO THE LAODICEANS

By REV. W. J. MCKNIGHT, D.D., Moderator of the Synod of the Reformed
Presbyterian Church of North America

THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE for facts. The Seven Churches were all in existence at the same time in Asia Minor. The epistles addressed to them grew out of the conditions prevailing among the membership in the respective cities. Everything mentioned in the epistles occurred within the circle of a half-century. John is dealing with life, with life as it is being lived under his eye at the moment. He is noting excellencies and defects, victories and failures, motives, ideals, ends, and aims, as they become visible in the character and conduct of the men among whom he has been affectionately toiling for many years. He is simply telling the truth about the churches in question. The effort, therefore, which is sometimes made, to transmute these epistles into so-called "predictive prophecies," as though they were written as types or allegories of what was to happen tandem in history, a period for an epistle, in unrolling ages, is to rob them ruthlessly of their true significance. John is depicting a sevenfold condition which existed then, and which has existed in its entirety in every age since that day.

As much as this needs to be said at the outset, seeing that the purpose now is to deal with the Letter to Laodicea, not only in a general way, but specifically with respect to its bearing on the times. There are untold millions of Christians today who would measure up favorably with the best of the members of the Seven

Churches. Unfortunately, however, there are some in the visible church in the present era whose profession is not indicative of any substantial reality in the heart. At bottom they are Laodiceans. Not forgetting, then, that the vast majority of professing Christians—at least for aught we know—are true believers, let us turn our thoughts to that more forbidding aspect of religious affairs which the letter describes.

Laodicea was a beautiful city. It looked toward the north from a range of mountains. Opposite it, about six miles away, was Hierapolis, which was seated on what looked like a frozen Niagara. With the sunlight playing on its petrified cascades it furnished the Laodiceans with an ever memorable view of scintillating splendor and deep impressiveness. As the Laodiceans sat and looked at Hierapolis, fitted like a crown on nature's scenery, they might well have said:

Toil could never compass it;
Art its height could never hit.

Yet this was but one of Laodicea's advantages. It was the home, or at least the pleasure resort, of the millionaires of its day. It was so wealthy that it declined the proffered help of Nero after it had been wrecked by an earthquake. It had its stadium, its theaters, its gymnasium equipped with baths and libraries and reading rooms, its odeum for the musically inclined, and of course its temples, though of these no traces have as yet been found. It had a constant supply of pure medicinal water, brought from a distant lake by a remarkable system that served the purpose perfectly. It was a center of commerce. It stood at the confluence of three great highways. It manufactured fabrics of the most delicate kind, and in the art of dyeing it was unexcelled. Its physicians were among the best in the

civilized world at the time. These are but hints; for, from a material and temporal point of view, Laodicea really "had need of nothing."

Naturally enough the Laodicean church had caught the city's attitude of mind and angle of repose. Spiritually speaking, it too, in its own judgment, "had need of nothing." The difference was, that the pagan population was right in its estimate, whereas the professedly Christian population was wrong. For comfort and enjoyment and wholesome, luxurious living the city had everything the mind could imagine or the heart desire. Its opinion of itself was based on undisputed facts. The church's views, on the contrary, were based on the shadow of a dream. It was building not on what it had, but on what it lacked. If it had been "cold" like its heathen neighbors, it would at least have been true as far as it had gone. It was worse off, infinitely worse off, than they were, for its foundation was not even "stubble"; it was nothing at all. No wonder that our Lord lamented that it was not "cold," for then it could thus far have been honest—which now it was not. It was so low spiritually that it even discredited Adam-hood. With this in mind, we are prepared for the epistle.

The Letter to Laodicea centers in the word "lukewarm." Yet it is not so much the term that gives meaning to the epistle as the epistle that gives meaning to the term. It is defined by the context. There are some things for which lukewarm water is quite acceptable, but not for drinking. The fact is, it is more or less eruptive in its tendencies. And in this neighborhood of hot springs, emitting tepid water disgustedly from the mouth was no doubt a comparatively common sight. For slaking thirst such a liquid was simply out of the

question. The significance of the Apostle's expression would therefore be patent to everyone to whom the epistle was originally addressed. The figure fits in perfectly with the local conditions. In the vicinity of Laodicea, at least, it would need no explanations.

The Laodiceans were unbearable. They could not be stomached. And no wonder. They had imbibed the city's spirit. That our Lord is not charging them with boasting of temporal riches is surely but little short of being obvious. As Alford says, "From the whole context it is evident that not outward worldly wealth, but imagined spiritual riches, are in question." Anyone who has a feeling for Greek will realize how strong the sentence is. In effect the Laodiceans were saying, 'If it is riches you are thinking about, we are the one church of all churches that is rich—rich toward God, we mean; the fact is, we have been filled with the true riches all along, and what we gained we still have; in a spiritual way, therefore, to be perfectly candid about it, we are in no need whatsoever.'

From this attitude, however, it is not necessary to infer that they were lacking in worldly goods. Indeed, their earthly possessions may have been the subtle means of furnishing them a starting point. If God was prospering them outwardly, was it not precisely because their lives inwardly had been so eminently exemplary? Riches, though good enough in themselves, are so very deceitful. They are so prone to lend themselves to false conclusions. A man is a professing Christian, and he has been favored above his fellows financially; therefore the inference is that God is with him. In such a way the worldly wealth of the Laodiceans may have insinuated itself into their frame of mind. It may have helped them to think that they had "need of nothing" spiritual-

ly. At all events, that is an effect which prosperity very often has.

The letter itself defines what lukewarmness is, for it informs us that the Laodiceans were "wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked." It is hard to imagine how they could have been worse. "Wretched"! That word is used on but one other occasion in the New Testament. Paul says, "Wretched man that I am!" Even the sin that still lurked in his regenerate life made him shudder. He was conscious of its presence all the time. He regarded it as a dead mass fastened to his soul. It kept him ever pressing closer and closer to Christ, ever asking over and over again, "Who shall deliver me?" It made him "wretched" to think that any sin whatsoever could still find a lodgment in the heart of a man for whom Christ had died. It kept him continuously contrite.

The Laodiceans had no such uneasiness. Where Paul's sins were as atoms, theirs were as immense as the Himalayas. But, as the word indicates, they were too unconcerned to open their eyes and look. They were guilty of what Carlyle calls the deadliest sin—"that same supercilious consciousness of no sin." Not that they could not have known their condition had they cared to, but simply that they were disinclined to investigate. If anyone had exhorted them to cry, 'Who shall deliver us?' they would have rubbed their eyes in bewilderment and have asked, 'Deliver us from what?' Wretched, spiritually gangrenous, and yet so used to it that they were not even uncomfortable!

It is hard to see why the Revision still clung to the word "miserable" in its rendering of the second adjective, which properly means "pitiable." When a person is miserable, he at least knows it. He may be "pitiable,"

however, without knowing it; indeed, it is often true that the most pitiable thing about men who are in bad case is that they do not know it. When Paul told the Corinthians that if they had set their hope in Christ only to have it hold good till they died, they were really in a worse condition than mankind in general, his meaning is transparent enough. As a group, they were a pitiable set. They were enduring shame and hardship, and now and then even martyrdom, when they might rather have been saying, 'Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die.' That is, they were in precisely the same predicament, if they only knew it, as the world at large. So here, where the word makes its only other appearance in the New Testament, the situation is almost identical. The lukewarm Laodiceans, though they were unaware of it, were one remove further from hope than were their cold worldly neighbors. What a "pitiable" lot they were—mistaking the flush of tuberculosis for the pink of health!

Furthermore, these Laodiceans were "poor"—poor as the rich man in the parable, and in the same way. They doubtless felt themselves to be on sociable terms with "father Abraham" without taking the pains to note that he was on the other side of the "gulf," and that, being on that side, he would be unable to help them when they would lift up their eyes, "being in torments." Poor, in spite of their self-complacent inner assurance that they had "need of nothing"! And "blind" withal! Blind, and yet saying to everybody as far as their corporate voice could reach, 'We see'! And so it is that Christ, in effect, says to them in this letter, "Therefore your sin remaineth." And last of all "naked"—exposed, as the seven sons of Sceva were when their rotten vestments were ripped away and they were seen to be

what they were in reality. Thus lukewarmness, as defined in these five items by our Lord Himself, is found to be the *Ultima Thule* in the vast ocean of human depravity. A "lukewarm Christian" is a contradiction in terms; a lukewarm man is not a Christian, and a Christian cannot be lukewarm. By Christ's definition, taken at its simple face value, they are at opposite poles.

And Oh, what a grief it was to Christ to have to say it! The epithet with which this letter opens amounts almost to an apology. It is as much as to say, 'My nature and character, as God and man, leave me no option in the matter.' Unpleasant and all as it was, it was a task that had to be done. Therefore, says Christ, tell them, first of all, that He who is taking the witness stand against them is the "Amen." There is no need in ransacking all the archives of philological lore to find some new or strange or cryptic meaning for that little word. Its significance is self-evident. It is a compressed oath. Used at the end of a prayer, it is the equivalent of saying, 'By my sincerity of heart in making these requests I am willing to stand or fall in the judgment of the Great Day. Even so, then, so let it be.' The "Amen" is He whom nothing but the blackest of blasphemy would venture to question or to doubt. To begin with, therefore, He is placed over against these Laodiceans, whose hypocrisy is complete. The contrast is infinite, as was visibly exemplified before the eyes of Peter, James, and John when the Lord Jesus, the "Amen," went up into a mountain to pray, and was transfigured before them. There the veil of His flesh became transparent, and allowed poor mortal man to "see him as he is." Tell these Laodiceans, then, says Christ to John, that I am "the Amen," "in whom is no guile."

But tell them, too, that I am "the faithful and true

witness." It almost sounds as though He were saying, 'I am exceedingly reluctant to take the stand against you, but of course, if I have to do it, I must tell the truth.' He was in the dilemma of being obliged to testify the worst conceivable things against a group of men and women whose love and loyalty He was in an agony to win. They were in position to help Him out, had they been so disposed, by pleading guilty. Accordingly He offers them this opportunity, as it were, before He takes the final step. 'Keep Me from taking the stand,' He says in effect, 'for if I have to do it, you may be sure that My testimony will be faithful and true.'

In English those two words, "faithful" and "true," sound very much as if He were saying the same thing twice, but in the Greek the second marks a distinct advance on the first. A witness is faithful when he can be trusted to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. With Christ on the stand there will be no shilly-shallying, no uneasy shifting from one position to another in any attempt to find relief by evading the issue, no hesitation, no variation or shadow of turning from the facts as they occurred or as they remain at the moment, nothing but straightforward veracity, pure and simple. The other word, "true," means that the witness in this instance is able to discern between what is real and what is only apparent. He is One who will be able to say, 'Yes, such and such was the fact in the case, but the reality lying back of the fact was this or that motive or intention or purpose, which did not appear on the surface.' In other words, the Laodiceans were face to face with a Witness whose eye sees omnisciently, and whose lips relate the truth exactly as He sees it. Who can think of Christ in this capacity without saying, as Moses said, "I exceedingly fear and quake"?

Still, however, there is hope. 'Tell them,' says Christ, 'that I am also "the beginning of the creation of God."' If, after conviction, they wanted to be created anew, they could come back to Him. He is the source and author of all creation, whether material or spiritual. The implication on the one hand is: 'Your present condition is hopeless, and so you must be born again'; while on the other it is: 'I am God, and not willing that any should perish; come unto Me, and I will give you life.'

How much this little classic preface means to helpless sinners, such as we all know ourselves to be, it is literally impossible to overestimate. The Judge on the white throne, even the Lord Jesus, is the "Amen," in whose character, to begin with, elemental integrity dwells irradiate. He is also the "faithful and true witness," whose testimony will recount every fact of our experience, item by item as it emerged into being, be it in the arena of thought or of word or of deed, and whose omniscience will weigh each respective incident, to its last infinitesimal ingredient, in the tremorless scales of eternity, and appraise it with infinite accuracy at its just valuation. And finally, He is the "beginning of the creation of God," the fountain of life and immortality, who is able and anxious to save to the uttermost anyone anywhere who is willing to come unto God by Him. The first term apprises us of the kind of court into which we are to be summoned; the second appals us by acquainting us with the kind of testimony we will have to face; the third beckons us by holding out before us the hope of mercy. In the first, we are shown the nature of the Judge; in the second, the veracity of the Witness; in the third, the heart of the Saviour.

What a masterpiece the Letter is! Keeping in mind

the threefold prefatory epithet, let us glance once more at its contents. To be sure, no hard and fast division is made; yet, for all that, the stages are quite discernible. First of all, there is the charge or accusation. It runs like this: 'I know what you are doing and how you are living. You are neither cold nor hot. I wish you were one or the other. You are lukewarm, and, if you remain in that condition, I am going to spew you out of my mouth. That you may realize that I am not trifling, and that my wrath is thoroughly aroused and my judgments impending, I swear by Him that liveth for ever and ever that your sentence has been pronounced, and that your day of doom is near at hand. Even so, amen.'

But the defendant pleads 'Not guilty.' He maintains that the charge of lukewarmness cannot be proved. In this event the Lord Jesus must take the stand. 'You are guilty,' He declares, 'in that you say that you are rich, that you have already gotten all the riches you want and still hold them, and that you have need of nothing; whereas, as a matter of fact, you do not know, or care to know, that you are wretched and pitiable and poor and blind and naked.' So the evidence is in; the case is closed; the defendant has nothing confronting him but "a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation" which shall devour him as an adversary of the living God.

One way out, however, still remains. If, even while now awaiting execution, they could only be persuaded to plead for mercy all would be well. Therefore the Lord Jesus comes forward once more, no longer as an accusing Judge or as an opposing Witness, but as an omnipotent Friend, "the beginning of the creation of God." "I counsel thee," He says. Even yet they had "an advocate with the Father." Nor does He say "to

buy of me" merely, but to buy of me as a friend. That little preposition "of" is always amiable; here, it is surcharged with profound concern and infinite compassion. "I counsel thee"—as of old, it is the voice of the Son of God, declaring, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love, and with loving kindness am I drawing thee." Really, as a piece of portraiture, depicting the anxiety of Christ Jesus to reach sinners who have actually out-heathened heathendom, and who in the matter of deliberate supercilious perversity have touched bottom, this Letter to the Laodiceans is without a parallel anywhere else in the Bible. The nearest approach to it is where the living God is pictured as crying, "O Ephraim, how shall I give thee up?"

What He counsels them to buy is well worthy of note. It can all be summed up in one word—character. Up to this moment they had been unregenerate, "carnally minded," therefore "dead in trespasses and sins." They were "in the flesh," and consequently could not "please God," all of which had been set forth in the testimony of the Faithful Witness. But now, that they might "come to be"—the Greek is so charmingly specific—what they had not as yet been, namely, Christians, something radical had to be done. To be sure, it was a delicate undertaking. A superlatively contented wise-acre is exceptionally hard to approach, especially with respect to anything that might tend to lessen his self-esteem. A hypocrite is constitutionally touchy. To reach these Laodiceans, therefore, the first step would have to be judiciously mild. If we let Browning say it, what the Lord Jesus had to meet was

That hateful smirk of boundless self-conceit
Which seems to take possession of the world
And make of God a tame confederate.

But our Lord, as always, was equal to the task. "I counsel thee" is civility at its perfectest. Nothing He could have said would have been less likely to irritate. Anyone reclaimed by listening and giving heed would ever afterwards be able truly to say, with the Sweet Singer of Israel, "Thy gentleness hath made me great." The setting throughout is clear. The "counsel" is being given from the outside. The palace of the heart is padlocked. The Crucified One has to do His talking through a closed door. Disdained, ill-treated, effronted, He has been standing and knocking for a long time; He is standing and knocking yet; and the implication is that He will keep on standing and knocking until "His head is wet with dew, and His locks with the drops of the night." "Behold, what manner of love"! Who but God could endure as much as that from hateful, smirking hypocrites?

And what He comes to give is character—"clean hands," a "pure heart," a "right spirit," a life "hid with Christ in God," the only treasure of real value ever possessed, or heard of, among men since the world began. He calls it "gold." It is fresh from the crucible through which it passed in the agonies of the Garden and the anguish of the cross. It is gold prepared for use under the infinitely fierce flames of the wrath of God, the only commodity, accordingly, which God can accept. "Buy of me" this gold, says Christ. It will cost you something of course. Without an effort you cannot cease to be

A lie that walks and eats and drinks.

The step will be humiliating. It will mortify your pride. But it will make you rich with the only riches that count. More than that, it will enable you to clothe yourself in keeping with your newly acquired wealth—

"in white raiment"; for, when the character is golden, its influence becomes immaculate. Moreover, with such a character, you will be able, for the first time in your life, to see things as they are. For one thing, you will then be able to see in what a tattered outfit of "filthy rags" you have heretofore been shamelessly strutting about. With the anointing of your eyes you will begin to appreciate the difference between the deformities of egotism and the "beauty of holiness." The world with its darkness will become a thing of the past; and life, real life, life made luminous by an orb of light in the inner man, will be yours on the instant, and yours for eternity. What more could He have offered?

One of the most remarkable things—not about this letter alone, but equally about the other six as well—is the way in which the language invariably conforms to the history, the thought, and the distinguishing characteristics of the cities where the respective churches were located. In fact, collectively considered, the Seven Letters display before the mind and imagination, in a sort of picturesque panorama, the entire system of grace, though particularly with respect to its finalities, its outcome, that is to say, in life and experience. Here the attitude of Christ toward men who are living in the very abyss of iniquity, and the attitude, in turn, of such men toward Christ are sketched as it were by the strokes of an artist on the canvas of the community where the church has its home. For illustrative purposes the method is complete.

The closing part of this letter in reality anticipates and paves the way for, what is still to be said in the twentieth chapter of this unparalleled book. The vividness of what Christ here says about the victor is largely lost in our English versions. Perhaps its significance

may be somewhat emphasized if rendered thus: 'The victor—what of him? Why, I will grant him, the instant he wins the struggle, the privilege of sitting down with Me, once for all, on My throne, even as I, for My part, overcame once for all, and sat down, once for all, with My Father on His throne.' In other words, the moment anyone steps out of darkness into light he shares the sovereignty of Christ. That minute he begins to "live and reign" with Him. That minute Christ can commence to make use of him in the work of binding Satan.

The Apocalypse is not a treatise on technology or a manual in mechanics; it sets forth, pictorially, what happens in the heart, in the sanctuary of the soul, as soon as the inner man, by the operation of the Spirit, lays hold of Christ as the Saviour of sinners. The contrast is strikingly forcible. As long as such were "luke-warm," they were under the world's feet; the world had its heel on their necks. Let them open the door to Christ, and instantly the world will be under their feet; they will be masters of everything of which Christ is the Master. Since all things were put under Him, all things will be put under them. He will lift them out of penury and raggedness and imbecility, and will set them at the helm of the universe. If we, without any reservations whatsoever, were to make Christ's thoughts and purposes and methods of work articulate in our lives, no machinations of our fellow men on earth or of "demons down under the sea" could balk us for an hour.

We need to realize, not what it means to "live and reign" with Christ in eternity, but what it means to live and reign with Him now and here, during our pilgrimage on earth. Of course we shall "live and reign" with Him over yonder, if we go there; how could we help it?

The Apocalypse tells us that "the tabernacle of God is with men." And since God is in His tabernacle, we as worshipers there can avail ourselves of His power and efficiency, if we only set ourselves to the task in the proper way. If any Laodicean would open the door of his heart and let the Saviour in, he would immediately find himself seated on the throne of the universe, side by side with the "Sovereign Seer of Time." A mere whim of the heart? Very well, we all have hearts, and what more could the heart want?

The Laodiceanism of today is about as of old. The world at large, of the present period, is in love with itself. The latest wave is the wave of Humanism. By its chief apostles we are told that "the goal of the humanist is poised and proportionate living. This he hopes to accomplish by observing the law of measure. Decorum is supreme for the humanist." Fine indeed, we might say, were it not for the trifling drawback, as we are informed again, that "the humanistic virtues—moderation, common sense, and common decency—go against the grain of the natural man, terribly against the grain, one is forced to conclude from a cool survey of the facts of history." So near, and yet so far. So easy, and yet so elusive. "That blessed word happiness! If only we were sure of attaining it on the human level, how the problem of purpose and value would be simplified! How easy the whole matter would be!" And how carefully, too, every item has been reasoned out—"The intuition of free will; the will exercised for a purpose directed to clothe human life with value; value measured by happiness—the chain is perfect, link by link, only at the end it seems to be attached to nothing." "The nightmare of Futility stalks before us. Futility is the final

word." A golden chain, attached to nothing! Rather "cold," is it not?

Thus the world's dilemma is bad enough, yet—and here it is the same as of old—not by any means as bad as that of the Laodiceans of today, whose names are inscribed on the church rolls. The world has at least enough discernment left to perceive that its reasoning, let it be as logical as it may, is "attached to nothing." Accordingly, there is some hope for it. It is still honest enough to acknowledge that the end of its system is "Futility." But how about the hundreds of thousands of church members, for example, who never see the inside of a church except on Easter? Or what about the literal millions who attend the churches on the earlier hours of the Sabbath, only to spend the rest of the day in such a way as to "crucify the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame"?

These, and such as these, will defend themselves. They are always ready to protest that if they never do anything worse than what they are doing at the moment they will get through all right. Spiritually they are "rich" enough. They "have need of nothing." Nothing is harder to deal with, or to overcome, than this same supercilious air of indifference. You cannot reason with it. You cannot even "counsel" it. It will not listen. The outstanding feature of the present age is its self-sufficiency. Here and there the world at large has its doubts, but the lukewarm Laodiceans have no misgivings. If they can only keep close enough to the church to have a minister of the Gospel conduct the customary obsequies at the time of their lamented demise, they are willing to take the chances, and "jump the life to come."

Surely to such as these it is that Christ would say today, if He were here, "I would that thou wert cold or

hot." In the church, but not of it. Near enough to share the church's benefits if they ever come to need them, but safely distant where duty calls, and hardships are to be endured, and burdens borne. This "lukewarm" attitude is the most hopeless frame of mind conceivable, and that it numbers its exponents, or shall we not rather say its victims, by its tens or even by its hundreds of thousands in these days of unexampled material prosperity is altogether undeniable. They have caught the spirit of the age; so that, as long as their pottage lasts, "they have need of nothing."

But blessed be God, there are others of a different type. It is so easy to overlook the quiet, unobtrusive "seven thousand" who have never "bowed the knee to Baal." Only God, and a few of their nearest neighbors perhaps, know who they are and what they are worth. They are "the salt of the earth," and the only reason why they are not heralded as "the light of the world" is because the world in its darkness "comprehendeth" them not. Of these there are doubtless many millions who would face death as calmly as did the martyrs of old before they would even think of breaking faith with Christ or of disowning Him as their Lord. All of us are sinners. We are coming short of the glory of God hour by hour as the days and years pass by. It is not our province to pronounce on one another. Yonder above us, open to our view, lies the realm of celestial love. Here in our breast, at the door of the inner man of the heart, stands Christ seeking, if not for entrance, at least for complete control.

Pray for a beam
Out of that sphere
Thee to guide and to redeem.

PERMANENT DEPOSITS OF COLONIALISM IN AMERICAN CHRISTIANITY

By ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Church History, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

AMERICAN CHRISTIANITY as we have it today is an on-going stream. It has had many tributaries in its course. The sources of the stream and of its tributaries have sometimes lain very close to one another, sometimes far apart. Mingling their waters in the bed of the main stream these tributaries have brought together a composite product whose component elements can now no longer be separated or strained out from one another. But they can be traced to their various sources. And present day Christianity will be better understood if each of its elements is traced to its source and followed through its devious route to its confluence with the other streams.

This view of American Christianity as a stream or process implies that its headwaters are varied, its tributaries numerous. It also implies that the color and temperature and consistency of the body vary with the soil and climate of the lands through which it flows. Each new stage in its progress leaves certain permanent deposits in its waters. The history of American Christianity may therefore be viewed as a series of cultural frontiers, each with its own religious soil and intellectual climate and general social atmosphere, and each making some permanent contribution to the complex structure of Christianity as we have it in America today.

The earliest of these cultural frontiers is colonialism.

It came to expression on the Atlantic seaboard of the North American continent during the two hundred years between the middle of the sixteenth century and the middle of the eighteenth. Colonialism is the spirit involved in the transplanting of a civilization from a mother country to a remote but dependent province. Its culture is derivative, the resultant of the traditions of the mother country and the environment of the new home. Its motive may be various—trade, imperialism, romance and adventure, economic necessity, religious freedom, religious conquest, social pressure. It is always mixed. Moreover, we must distinguish between the motives of the colonizing powers and those of the colonists. No one social factor is the key to the interpretation of American history, religious or general. But the most important single motive in the discovery, exploration, and colonization of America was the religious motive.

There is abundant evidence that Columbus was a man of genuine religious feeling and that his many professions of religious interest were sincere. His great enterprise that resulted in the re-discovery of this Western continent was motivated by his deep Catholic loyalty quite as much as by any other motive. It was his pious attitude that won him the friendship of Friar John Perez, kept him undaunted in the face of tremendous difficulties and repeated repulses, and finally gained the favor of the "most Christian Queen" Isabella. The Spanish monarchs with whom Columbus negotiated were distinguished by their personal piety and their zeal on behalf of Christian civilization. Ferdinand, the Catholic, had earned his pious title by the expulsion of all Jews from Spain. He had seen the Moorish domination in Spain brought to an end. These

events he interpreted as the call of Providence to propagate the unmixed Catholic faith as widely as possible beyond the borders of Spain. Columbus' undertaking therefore appeared to the Spanish sovereigns in the light of a new crusade, and this feeling the great mariner himself fully shared. In their agreement with him, April 17, 1492, his voyage is expressly connected with that glittering hope of the centuries, the rescue of the Holy Sepulcher from the hands of the infidel.

When Columbus' first voyage failed to bring him into contact with the infidel Turk, his religious zeal and that of the Spanish sovereigns was directed to a new objective, the swarthy-skinned pagans of the newly discovered land. Accordingly when Columbus departed on his second voyage to America he carried with him the injunction of Isabella "to labor in all possible ways to bring the Indies to a knowledge of the holy Catholic faith." He also carried twelve priests and the "Vicar Apostolic to the Indians." Thereafter the conversion of the natives was one of the primary considerations in all the correspondence and formal enactments concerning the new country. In the famous bulls of partition issued by Pope Alexander VI in 1493 it is assumed that Ferdinand and Isabella were moved by "the intent to bring the inhabitants of the same to honor our Redeemer and profess the Catholic faith." This accords fully with the statements of those sovereigns themselves, for example: "The conversion of the Indians formed the principal foundation of the conquest,—that which ought principally to be attended to."

Some of the American aborigines were taken along back to Spain, and six of them were baptized at Barcelona as shining trophies of the conquering cross in the strange country. The King and Queen themselves

stood sponsors at the baptism. When one of these new converts succumbed to the enervating influences of his new surroundings any sorrow that may have been felt at his death was completely lost in the notes of exultation because he had the distinct honor of being "the first Indian ever admitted to heaven." Illustrious firstfruits of flaming Christian endeavor for America!

These evangelistic efforts among the American Indians from the earliest voyages of discovery definitely connect American colonialism with religious propaganda. Moreover, the crusading impulse was not entirely lost from Columbus' mind. He never ceased to regard himself as the servant of the church. Just before his fourth voyage to America he renewed his promise to devote the revenue of the newly discovered lands to the rescue of the Holy City from the Saracen. The appetite for treasure ships never extinguished the religious motive that dominated his actions.

In the exploration of our country also, the religious motive was an important factor. The student of this part of our history is impressed with the recurrence of religious names: Santa Maria, San Salvador, Santiago, San Domingo, Sante Fe, La Trinidad, Los Angeles, Espiranto Santo (the Mississippi River), and the multitude of other saints. The oldest map of the continent, that of LaCosa in 1500, contains a vignette representing Christopher (the Christ-bearer) wading through the waters carrying on his shoulders the infant Christ, or Sun of Righteousness, to shine on the heathen. And another old map, dated 1508, gives to the newly discovered lands the title, "*terra sancti crucis sive novus mundus*." The reports and diaries of the explorers abound in references to the glory of God, the rescue of the Holy Sepulcher, and the conversion of the Indians.

In many cases doubtless these sacred names and pious phrases were mere euphemisms. Europe was just emerging from "the ages of faith," and there was much cant on the popular tongue. Some of it lies embedded even in the language of our own day. But after every allowance is made for euphemism and conventional phraseology, there yet remains a considerable residuum of genuine religious interest.

The presence of religious personalities on every voyage of exploration joined the work of religion with the adventure of the explorer. Franciscans and Dominicans, and later Jesuits, manifested a zeal and heroism in the American wilderness that constitutes a notable chapter in the history of Christian devotion. However much we may deprecate some of the methods that were employed in the missionary advance in that early day, there can be no doubt about the genuine devotion of the missionary explorers, their willingness to undergo privation and danger for the sake of their religion, to suffer torture and agonizing death in their zeal for the cross and the church. Everywhere the friar and priest led in the European thrust into American soil, planting their schools of religion, their missionary institutions, their churches and hospitals, expanding the borders of papal dominion, and fashioning the literature for the propagation of the faith.

Whether we view the militant ecclesiasticism of a revived Spanish Catholicism, which had learned from Islam to enslave first and convert afterwards, and which sustained its whole fabric of ecclesiastical fanaticism in Florida and New Mexico and California by the force and terror of physical cruelty, or whether we view the more crafty and diplomatic strategy of the Jesuits under the French flag a century later, with their high-

wrought plan for a Christian empire that would permanently seal to the papacy the very heart of the North American continent, from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the mouth of the Mississippi, a plan whose imperial grandeur and moral dignity roused the enthusiastic admiration of our historian Francis Parkman, it is clear that for more than two centuries after its rediscovery by Columbus this country, so far from being an object solely of European exploitation for trade and conquest, was widely regarded as a domain for religious expansion.

The colonization of North America, too, proceeded in large measure from religious causes. This is clear if we examine the general European background from which the American colonies issued. Many of the people who settled the colonies were drawn to the New World by love of adventure or hope of gain. More of them were thrust out of the Old World by economic stress or religious faith. Just before the era of colonization began the mind of the average European had become more enlightened, his horizons widened, his conscience quickened. The stolid ecclesiastical frigidity of the Middle Ages had begun to break up under the warm atmosphere of the Reformation. The melting process begun at Augsburg (1555) and Nantes (1598) was continued in Westphalia (1648) and Cromwell's Commonwealth (1649) and many other places.

The disintegration of old ecclesiastical organizations and the discarding of old authorities bred an atmosphere of dissent that constitutes the background of the founding of most of the American colonies. Certainly dynastic and economic elements mingled with more idealistic motives in the colonizing activities of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But the social transforma-

tions that facilitated colonization may be traced in every case to religious motives or events. The profound religious changes associated with the Reformation movement not only broke up the stern rule of ecclesiastical dogmatism but also ended the rigidity of medieval economic life and gave success to the rising tide of revolution in politics. The coming of numerous small religious bodies, the controversies and persecutions that raged in many places on account of religion, the general unrest and mobility that this produced in other spheres of life—these are the elements that stimulated colonial expansion both in England and on the Continent.

The most cursory reading of the charters of the colonizing companies, the colonizing grants of royalty, the regulations for the government of the several colonies, the advertisements for colonists or the correspondence of the settlers themselves would give the impression that the whole work of colonization was an enterprise of Christian piety. The most persistent note is the care for services of worship, the diligent provision for churches and clergy, the Christian conduct of the colonists, and the devout concern for the souls of the aborigines. And this was not limited to any colony or group of colonies. The planters of Virginia were quite as anxious as the pilgrims of Plymouth to “recover poor and miserable souls out of the arms of the devil” and “accomplish the number of the elect.” The “Holy Commonwealth” of the New England theocracy and the “Holy Experiment” of William Penn, the tolerant professions of Lord Baltimore and the splendid philanthropy of General Oglethorpe find their parallels in most of the other colonies in a multitude of statutes, orders, and decrees pertaining to religion and morality. And even if large deduction is made from the face value

of the records and every allowance for the incrustation of pious rhetoric and euphemistic subterfuge, still it is only by doing great violence to those records that the historian can conclude that any other than the religious motive was the earliest and most dominant. When it was not the church seeking territory to enlarge its dominion or representatives of the church seeking souls to save, it was the dissenter or independent, clerical or lay, seeking a haven of religious practice.

What permanent deposit of this aspect of colonialism do we find in our American Christianity today? The relatively large influence of Christianity in molding American habits and institutions. Not only did the enterprises of colonial expansion on American shores exhibit religion entering as a new force, or at least as this force in a new degree, into the making of world dominion, but these enterprises permanently colored American national life with a strong tinge of religious interest. The predominance of the religious motive in the era of colonization brought it about that American culture to this day is strongly suffused with religious motives and traditions. Christianity is a permanent force in American social life, not indeed as a bureau of state, not as a formalty or a mere profession to be inscribed on the official banner, but as a vital force, definitely marking our mentality, determining our attitudes, and giving modes and patterns to our conduct as well as our thought.

Let us state this judgment in terms of comparison: The intensity of the religious interest that lay behind the discovery, exploration, and settlement of America has made Christianity a more potent factor in molding American character and American institutions than it is in any other country of modern times.

Such a sweeping statement of self-appraisal must not rest on the testimony of any American or group of Americans. We call to witness on this matter some discriminating observers from Europe, whose testimony will not be easily discredited. First, a Frenchman of Roman Catholic antecedents. Alexis de Tocqueville, writing in 1832, said:

Religion in America takes no direct part in the government of society, but it must be regarded as the first of their political institutions. . . . The greatest part of British America was peopled by men who after having shaken off the authority of the Pope acknowledged no other religious supremacy; they brought with them into the new world a form of Christianity which I cannot better describe than by styling it a democratic and republican religion . . . and from the beginning politics and religion contracted an alliance which has never been dissolved. [*Democracy in America*, translation of 12th ed., vol. I, pp. 390, 383 f.]

Two generations later, in 1894, James Bryce, the Free Churchman of England, in his classic analysis of American institutions, wrote:

The influence of Christianity seems to be greater and more wide-spread in the United States than in any part of western Continental Europe and I think greater than in England. . . . It was religious zeal and religious conscience which led to the founding of the New England colonies two and a half centuries ago,—those colonies whose spirit has in such large measure passed into the whole nation. Religion and conscience have been a constantly active force in the American commonwealth ever since. [*American Commonwealth*, 3rd ed., pp. 710, 727.]

The Swiss Reformed theologian Adolph Keller, who has had abundant opportunity to observe American Christianity at first hand in our day, in his book of 1922 observes:

The American churches . . . feel, perhaps more strongly than any other churches in the world, the duty of making effective in public life the motives and ideals that come from

Christianity. . . . The very origins of the social and political organism of the Union are deeply rooted in religious convictions and religious factors. [*Dynamis*, pp. 84, 1.]

And the Lutheran pastor and writer of Berlin, Herman Sasse, a careful observer of religious conditions in our country, wrote in 1927:

There is a strong churchly tradition in America, a wholesome, naive loyalty to the churches that comes down from colonial times. Religion belongs to the life of the land. It belongs to the civilization of the people. . . . In that country there is no yawning gulf between religion and culture, between church and secular civilization, as is found among European peoples. [*Amerikanisches Kirchentum*, pp. 10, 9.]

It will be noted that all of these witnesses speak in comparative terms, and all of them connect the relatively great influence of Christianity in American life with our colonial origins.

Another permanent deposit of colonialism has come from the aggressive evangelistic spirit that nearly everywhere accompanied the work of colonization. Deplore as we may the methods of force and terror employed by the Spanish Catholics in their early efforts to convert the natives of North America, the fact remains that those crude efforts definitely opened the era of modern missions. The Spaniard was genuinely concerned for the spiritual interests of the benighted peoples whom he encountered in the wilderness. Charles V was doubtless expressing his own sincere feeling and that of all the leaders in American explorations when he said, as early as 1523, "My principal interest in the discovery of new lands is that the inhabitants, who are without the light of faith, be brought to understand the truth of our holy Catholic religion . . . that they may become Christians and be saved."

The heartless methods of exploitation which the

Spaniard mingled with his missionary efforts can be explained partly out of their Spanish background and partly as pioneering experiments among aboriginal folk. Those efforts failed, but they permanently fixed on the spirit of colonialism the task of evangelization.

The grand scheme for French empire in America continued the Spanish tradition concerning the religious responsibility of a higher to a lower civilization. It was a great improvement in method. With splendid devotion and heroic suffering the spiritual arm of the French emprise sought to establish its sway over the savage heart through the influence of Christian love and self-sacrifice. The ultimate failure of these magnificent evangelistic efforts was due, partly to the disposition in the Jesuit leaders to compromise the essential principles of Christianity through artful concessions to heathenism, and partly to their besetting propensity to political intrigue. But again the marks of missionary propaganda are clearly seen on the countenance of colonial enterprise in America.

When Englishmen began in America the efforts at colonization that were in the end to prove so eminently successful, one consideration that weighed more or less with those who engineered the colonizing projects was to match with Protestant statistics the record of the papists who had gained millions of converts from among the pagans. The missionary impulse among English colonists, suggested by Spanish and French antecedents and furthered by national sentiment and antipapal zeal, was stimulated also by social considerations. If the native was to become a safe neighbor to the English colonist the effort to evangelize him had to include also the effort to civilize him. It is highly significant that at this critical period, when the structural base of

American culture was being laid, the religious responsibility of European Protestantism to the aboriginal American should be so keenly realized. It invested the whole missionary enterprise with permanent social and industrial significance.

In every colony on the Atlantic seaboard, among the representatives of every church or religious body, however small, the impulse to aggressive evangelization among the natives was felt and acted on. As soon as their homes were set up and their governments established they went out to Christianize and Europeanize the Indian. The motives were mixed—ecclesiastical aggrandizement, fear of the tomahawk, romance, a sense of justice to the dispossessed native, a genuine concern for his soul. At first the financial support for the project had to be drawn from beyond the ocean, and in this way it led to the formation of missionary societies both in England and on the Continent long before Carey's day. But it soon developed a sympathetic missionary constituency among the American colonists and their churches. The results were a volume of worthy evangelistic endeavor with many a chapter of heroic sacrifice and Christian devotion, many an institution of Christian mercy and enlightenment, many a Christian manuscript of translated or original document, and a long array of honored names that shine like bright stars in the dark canopy of the American wilderness of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The permanent deposit of this trait in American colonialism was to stamp the missionary note indelibly upon American Christianity. The objective of that missionary impulse has changed completely and many times during the last two centuries. The primary motive has altered from time to time. But to this day Ameri-

can Christianity is intrinsically propulsive and aggressively evangelistic. In its hands lie two-thirds of all the missionary work carried on among Protestants. It is always ready to undertake the rigor of colonial expansion on behalf of the Kingdom of God.

Yet another deposit of the spirit of colonialism must be mentioned. It is the diversified character of American Christianity. This is more important in its consequences for American church history than either of the other two elements above mentioned. Planted in colonial times and made permanent by the political settlement at the establishment of the republic, it has entered vitally into all subsequent history of American Christianity. In fact, the variety of religious type that populated the original thirteen colonies was largely instrumental in securing the guarantees of religious liberty in this nation, and without religious liberty it is very doubtful whether the distinctively Christian character of the nation or its strong missionary impulse could have been preserved.

Religious colonialism, wherever it appears, is actuated either by purposes of conquest or by purposes of refuge. Its agent is either the missionary enthusiast or the persecuted radical. But whether it is carried by the idealist and missionary or by the refugee and radical, colonialism is addressed to the relatively unoccupied portions of the earth or to those portions that are occupied by people regarded as religiously inferior to the colonizing power. In either case it invites experimentation with the problem of toleration and liberty. To the student of church history, therefore, the North American continent, with its open spaces and its wide unpeopled stretches of territory, appears as a great stage with raised curtain on which during the sixteenth,

seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries was enacted a fascinating interplay between the forces of religious authority and the forces of religious dissent. The happy denouement of that thrilling drama was the friendly separation of church and state in the American republic and the fullest guarantee of complete religious liberty for every American citizen.

Ecclesiastical uniformity for American soil was definitely rejected in colonial times. At our distance the significance of the events seems clear. With the Roman Catholic Church colonialism is the martial and conquering spirit that aims at the extension of the Church's dominion and insists upon uniformity or perishes in the effort to enforce it. With Protestants it is the persuasive and permeating enterprise of missions that also for the most part aims at uniformity, but as a matter of historic fact always breeds dissent and lives upon it. Each of these types of colonialism had its day on American soil. The religious history of colonial times is, therefore, a series of experiments, a succession of acts and scenes, and the main plot is the search for an adjustment between the Old World principle of an authoritative and interpreting church, and the New World idea of ecclesiastical independence, an untrammelled conscience, a free church in a free state. Mingled with the practical undertaking of subduing a new continent to the purposes of civilization is the effort of each party, established and dissenter, to subdue the will of the other to his own religious principle. Even the dissenter, when he succeeds in establishing himself in a place of authority, only calls forth a new line of dissent, and so the process goes on. The net result of the process in colonial America was to lay the structural base for the diversified Christianity of the Ameri-

can nation yet to be born. It marked an important stage in the democratization of Christianity.

Here the story may only be sketched. First came the efforts of Catholic Spain. If the Spanish efforts at colonization had succeeded, the result would have been ecclesiastical uniformity under the Roman papacy. But those efforts failed for lack of strategy. North America was not to repeat the experience of South America or Central America or Mexico. The Spanish failure was to point the lesson for all time, that the responsibility of a higher to a lower civilization can never be discharged by force, and that the effort to do so is a sign of decay.

Then came Catholic France. If the French scheme for colonial empire on this continent had succeeded, this country could never have become the world's greatest adventure for the establishment of free religion and free government. Religious and political imperialism would then have reigned for centuries—French monarchy and Roman papacy—and the results would probably have been similar to those of the French Revolution. But it was worth much to have religious imperialism so thoroughly tried on colonial soil, with such sagacity and moral insight as the Frenchman and the Jesuit gave to their unparalleled enterprise. And the failure of the French effort to establish ecclesiastical uniformity in America was not due to any lack of strategy or to any other weakness in the scheme itself. It was due to the spirit of colonialism, the dependence of French America upon European monarchy and its varying fortunes. In the middle of the eighteenth century, after one hundred and fifty years of French domain in America, if we divide the continent into twenty-five equal parts, France held twenty parts, Spain four, and

England only one. But a few years later, as a result of French reverses in the Seven Years' War in Europe, the whole splendid structure of French empire in America came under the English flag. The second and last effort to establish ecclesiastical uniformity over all North America had ended in glorious failure. The forces of history simply refused to obey the bulls of Alexander VI.

The third act in the drama that was to end with a free church in a free state was the planting of religious variety along the Atlantic seaboard of the continent. The main facts are familiar—among the several colonies a variety of religious type, depending upon the origin of the colonists, the circumstances of colonization, or the place of settlement; in most of the colonies a "standing order" or dominant type of Christianity, but in every colony also a considerable tradition of dissent; the infusion of new vigor into all American Christianity, particularly into the dissentient elements, through the Great Awakening; the crystallizing of dissenters into *religiones licitae* and the overthrow of parish despotism; the constant agitation by these vigorous minorities on behalf, first, of religious toleration, and then of religious equality; their collusion with one another and their utilizing of circumstances during and after the Revolution to overthrow the church establishments in most of the colonies or states; securing the separation of church and state, both in the Federal Constitution and in the several state constitutions, largely out of consideration for the fact that "in this great and extensive empire there is and will be a great variety of sentiments in religion among its inhabitants." By these steps the spirit of colonialism left a permanent deposit in the stream of American Christianity that constitutes one of

America's greatest contributions to modern religion and politics.

Thus, through the lens of colonialism two of the principles of the great Reformers themselves are made to converge upon American institutions. One of these, the universal priesthood of Martin Luther, called forth the radical independence of Roger Williams. The other, the moral earnestness of John Calvin, called forth the mystic emotionalism of Jonathan Edwards. These two streams of influence converging in colonial Christianity left a permanent deposit of religious diversity and crystallized dissent. And this in turn was the chief element in producing the voluntary principle of Christian organization, the guarantee of religious freedom.

These, then, are some of the permanent deposits left in the stream bed of American Christianity as it passed through the cultural frontier of colonialism: The relatively large influence of Christianity as a force in American social life, its aggressive evangelistic spirit, and the religious diversity so characteristic of our history.

THE MISSIONARY WORK OF THE MORMONS

By REV. W. M. PADEN, D.D.

TO INCREASE or hold its membership and place as a religious cult, Mormonism must maintain its distinction and major in propagandism. Its highly organized and authoritative priesthood, with its prophet, seer, and revelator as *pontifex maximus*, and its chosen body of co-operants who are committed to the peculiar claims of Mormonism by secret covenants made in temples closed to all save tested initiates, see that the cult maintains its distinction and keep it tied in with the claims of its founder, Joseph Smith. Its missionary policy and methods keep the distinctive claims of Joseph and his successors before the Mormon people and press these claims on the outside world.

The first Mormon missionaries went out as agents to sell Smith's *Golden Bible*, or *The Book of Mormon*. To this day Mormon missionaries specialize in selling or circulating the book from which their cult gets its name rather than in selling or circulating the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. In order to sell *The Book of Mormon* the agents who were sent out in 1830 were obliged to stand for the claims of its "author and proprietor." These claims implied and led to the organization of the Mormon Church and the repudiation of all other religious bodies as corrupt—their creeds an abomination. The propagandists then went about among their kinsmen and neighbors with claims that Joseph was a prophet and that the gift of revelation

had been restored through him. Joseph was not slow to use his supposititious gift. His earlier "revelations" served as publicity for *The Book of Mormon*, but later they took the form, and claimed the authority, of covenants and commandments for his followers. Within a few years he had given them another book of modern scriptures, now called *The Doctrine and Covenants*, to feed their credulity and hold the new sect together.

As the society increased Joseph's assurance increased, but many of the early recruits were hard to manage. Dissension was rife in Kirtland. It soon became evident that it would be easier to make converts away from, rather than in and about, the new Zion. The prophet was without honor in his own country and soon left it for Missouri and Nauvoo. Having gathered the faithful remnant of his Kirtland followers to "the land of Missouri," and a few years later to Nauvoo, Illinois, Joseph took charge of the new headquarters and receiving station as mouthpiece, revelator, and supreme master, and sent out the stronger men of his colony to seek new blood for his "coagulation." At one time during the early forties nine of his twelve apostles were in Europe and the British Isles pressing Joseph's claims as a prophet and selling futures in his promised land.

Few recruits were obtained on the Continent; but the missionary work of Brigham Young, Heber Kimball, Wilford Woodruff, and their coworkers in the British Isles was notably fruitful. Many of the common people were ready for almost any new thing. The new apostles and missionaries were cocksure in their testimony regarding the new prophet, Joseph Smith, and the inspiration of his new additions to the Scriptures. They preached their doctrines with dogmatic unction.

They told of the new church of Latter-day Saints which, in expectation of an imminent millennium, was to gather at a new Jerusalem in the new world. So the missionaries were at once recruiting officers and immigration agents for the new church, its new Zion, and its new land of promise. According to Linn's story of the Mormons, "The general conference of 1850 reported that the Mormons in England and Scotland numbered 27,863, and in Wales 4,342. The report for June, 1851, showed a total of 30,747 proselytes in the United Kingdom and said: 'During the last fourteen years more than fifty thousand have been baptized in England, of which nearly 17,000 have migrated from her shores to Zion.'"

After the lamentable death of Joseph Smith, the debacle of the colony at Nauvoo, and the hegira of Brigham Young and his remnant of faithfuls to Utah much of the effort of his agents, or missionaries, was given to gathering the scattered adherents of Joseph's vintage to the new Zion in Utah. By way of gathering the saints of the dispersion who could not buy passage to Utah, Brigham incorporated and launched his famous or notorious emigration fund. Loans from this fund were secured by obligations which virtually put the aided immigrants into the "clutches of the church." These loans were advertised and negotiated by the Mormon emigration agents or missionaries, and the children of Ephraim, as the Mormons call themselves, flocked to Zion as the gulls flock to Great Salt Lake—and the gull is the sacred bird of the Mormons. The British agency of the church reports that, between 1852 and 1855, 10,978 Mormons had been shipped to Utah. While quite a number of them were Scandinavians and

a few were Germans, the gatherings from other European countries were negligible.

The revelation on plural marriage, released by Brigham in 1854, disillusioned many of the British Mormons, and special efforts were made by apostolic delegates and missionaries to salvage the fruits of these earlier missions. So, owing to the emigration of the saints who were ready to swallow Mormonism whole and the defection of thousands who refused to do so, the number of Mormons in the United Kingdom has never since then equalled the Mormon enrolment in the forties and fifties. Much the same is true of Mormon missions in Scandinavia. Many of the Swedes and Danes came or were brought to Utah during the years of "gathering," and many of them have had their rewards, especially the Danes, in wives and ecclesiastical or civic preferment. Some of these Northmen and many of the British groaned so audibly under the mortgages held on their possessions by the church immigration company that in 1880 half the accumulation of principal and interest on these claims, which then amounted to \$1,604,000, was cancelled, and a few years later (1887) an Act of Congress was passed which dissolved this company and relieved the perpetual irritation incident to the pressure of its indigestible claims.

Mr. Roberts writes of this pet scheme of Brigham: "This fund, conceived in such noble spirit, was the means of bringing tens of thousands of the landless poor to the unoccupied lands of the Great Basin." Susie Young Gates, in her recent life of Brigham Young, her father, says of his scheme: "Thus began the vast movement of Mormon emigration which has brought over 100,000 members of the church to America, chiefly to western America, from European

shores." Apostle Widtsoe, now President of the European mission, a Norwegian by birth, makes much larger claims for the foreign born saints, writing in the Christmas issue of *The Deseret News*: "More than 200,000 men and women of European birth have accepted the restored gospel of Jesus Christ. They and their descendants are the bone and sinew in the body of the church. Most of these European converts have gathered with the body of the Saints in the West, but many have remained in their native lands to maintain outposts of Zion for the better progress of the work of the Lord." It should be noted in passing that only a small percentage of this emigration, and most of that from left-over Mormon families, has occurred during the present generation.

The Mormons call all those who "do their missions" outside of Mormonaria "Foreign missionaries," even those who missionate in the city of Brooklyn or the mountains of Tennessee. They have never been able or very persistently eager to make converts among peoples who are without Christian traditions. Their attempts to establish missions in Japan and China, or even in Turkey, have been futile. For their mission work has been largely parasitic. This they acknowledge when they speak of their converts as "proselytes." They find it easier to reach half-hearted Christians than to reach raw pagans, easier to reach semi-attached members or adherents of the Christian church than to reach Buddhists or Moslems. Even where they have had some success in gaining converts whose skins are neither white nor black, as among the native Hawaiians, the Samoans, and the Maoris of New Zealand, they have followed, rather than preceded, the Christian missionaries.

As a matter of fact, the Mormon cult has been handicapped by the teachings of *The Book of Mormon* concerning the curse of color. In speaking of the Lamanites, the supposititious ancestors of the American Indian, *The Book of Mormon* says: "And he [the Lord] caused the cursing to come upon them, yea even a sore cursing because of their iniquities; wherefore, as they were white and exceeding fair and delightsome, that they might not be enticing unto my people, the Lord God did cause the skin of blackness to come upon them." This color line, which excludes the black man from the priesthood of the Mormon Church, has never been broken down by its missionaries. While they have gone to South Africa with the gospel according to Joseph Smith they have never sought to make converts of the African natives, nor does the church do mission work among the Negroes of our own country.

The Mormon commentators, however, quote Brigham Young as giving the black man millennial hopes. In one of his sermons he dealt with this matter, saying: "Why are so many of the inhabitants of the earth cursed with the skin of blackness? It comes in consequence of their fathers rejecting the power of the holy priesthood and the law of God. They will go down to death and, when all the rest of the children have received their blessings in the holy priesthood, then the curse will be removed from the seed of Cain." This seems to mean that the Negroes who die before all the rest of "God's chillun" are saved may have opportunity to accept the gospel according to Joseph Smith in the intermediate state and so may become white and "delightsome" and be admitted to the priesthood and celestial glory with Joseph and Brigham.

In more recent years the Mormon Church has done

more mission work in our own country, with the exception noted above, than in lands beyond the seas. Its mission work in Europe was virtually dropped during the World War, though Mormon chaplains sought to hold Mormon soldier boys true to the faith of their fathers. Since the war the European missions have been re-opened and re-inforced. Of the 2000 missionaries reported at the last conference of the church, at least 1200 are at work in the United States. These missionaries are directed from headquarters located in Brooklyn, Atlanta, Louisville, Chicago, Minneapolis, Los Angeles, and Portland, Oregon, each with its mission president and each visited from time to time by apostolic delegates or the President of the church. The mission presidents are usually men of experience and special standing in Mormon affairs. James H. Moyle, now President of the Eastern Mission, with headquarters in Brooklyn, is prominent not only as a Mormon but also in politics, having served as assistant secretary of the treasury under William F. McAdoo. The California Mission, with headquarters in Los Angeles, is now getting the lion's share of attention from the "Lion of the Lord." There are over 6,000 members and ten churches in the recently organized stake of Los Angeles. The President of the mission reports that the church now has 10,500 members in California.

In the days of Brigham Young proselytes were urged to gather in Utah. A little later they were encouraged to found colonies in southern Idaho and northern Arizona. Now, as the Mormon leaders note the disposition of their people to scatter from, rather than to congest in, Brigham's land of promise, they are advising the saints of the dispersion and new converts made outside of Mormonaria to make homes and

organize churches where they are. As we read in the present day manual for missionaries: "All Saints should be encouraged to remain in the mission fields and assist in building up branches of the church. Where those are found who are anxious and determined to remove the circumstances should be reported to the mission president for he is in the best position to advise in all such cases."

In speaking of the need of temples outside of Utah Mr. Roberts writes: "In recent years the Saints have been spreading abroad from the old centers of population in Utah and other sections of the Great Basin. The church of the new dispensation can no longer be thought of as being limited by the boundary lines of Utah. The church in popular thought must now mean more than Utah. It is no longer 'Utah and the Mormons' that used to be sung about as identical, but a larger and still expanding Mormonism that challenges our own admiration and the attention of the world." In line with this policy the Mormon Church, which claims to have 500 members in Washington, has purchased a conspicuous corner in the national capital and has broken ground for a church, social hall, and church offices costing over \$200,000. It will hardly need to be christened 'The Smoot Memorial.'

Tourists who visit Salt Lake City may not know that the information bureau, located just inside the gates of the temple ground, has been "raised in title and work to the dignity of one of the most important missions of the church in the United States." At present it is presided over by Levi Edgar Young, a high official in the Mormon Church, a graduate of Harvard, and a professor in Utah State University. Of this temple mission, with its bureau of information, the most recent

writer on the mission work of the church reports: "Many of the [Mormon] business and professional men of Salt Lake City, as well as specially appointed missionaries, labor there, giving their time and talents daily in the cause of the Lord. It is a worthwhile undertaking and has produced some notable and gratifying results. It is estimated that over 200,000 people—very many of them tourists and Gentiles—have been directly or indirectly touched by this mission, with its organ recitals in the nearby tabernacle, each year during the last five years."

As has been noted, when the Mormons speak of foreign missionaries they refer, not only to missionaries sent across the seas, but to all those who conduct their missions away from home. Home missionaries are men and women called and set apart to conduct missions in communities where there are organized stakes. So when President Grant reports 2,068 men and women on "foreign missions," he reports in addition 903 as "engaged in missionary work in the organized stakes of Zion." Few of us who have made our homes in Mormonaria have not been visited by these home missionaries. Their zeal has more than once been provoking in the good sense of the word.

Another type of missionary work is not so well known, that done by the living chiefly for the dead in one or other of the seven Mormon temples. The temple recorders report that 68,578 men and women were commissioned to carry on this sacred and secret covenanting and proxy mission work during the year ending April, 1930.

Each temple has its body of missionaries, called "temple workers," who have charge of the temple rites and ceremonies. To these missionaries President Grant

said, at the close of his last statistical report: "I desire to express my appreciation to the many hundred who are working in our temples without remuneration, several hundred in the Salt Lake temple alone. In all our temples an immense wonderful work is being accomplished, all on missionary time, and I appreciate it."

President Grant is himself becoming an addict to this proxy mission work. In a recent address he said: "I am deeply interested in genealogical work. I had the pleasure on Friday night of going through the temple with a company of twenty-two relatives and friends. On an average from twelve to more than twenty of us, representing the Grant family, go through the temple once each week. I have one person going through the temple at my expense. [You can hire a proxy to do your proxy work.] I have also in my employ a sister who devotes all of her time to the preparation of genealogical work. Last year I expended in the neighborhood of \$200 per month during the entire year for genealogical research-work pertaining to the families to which I belong in direct descent and through marriage." Of the prophet's example an endowment official writes: "Probably the most powerful influence in bringing about the present awakening is the shining example of President Heber J. Grant. No one can fail to understand his teaching. No one can plead lack of time for the sacred work in face of the record he has made. From January 1, 1929, to November 24, 1930, President Grant and family have performed a total of 4,430 temple ordinances, a large proportion of these ordinances being for the dead."

The late President Joseph F. Smith once said: "We do more work for the dead than for the living." B. H. Roberts, in his recent centennial *History of the*

Mormon Church, supports this statement with temple statistics: "The volume of ordinance work for the dead far exceeds the volume of work done for the living,—not only that done in the temple for the living [marriage for eternity, etc.] but I mean more than has been done for the living, both inside and outside the temple, from first to last. In round numbers 15,000,000 of ordinances have been performed vicariously for the dead, of which ordinances nearly 7,000,000 have been baptisms for the dead,—all this since the opening of the temple at Nauvoo for the celebration of such ordinances."

The rank and file of the Mormon mission force is drawn from the 930 organized wards of the church, each ward being subject to the demands of the President of the church and the suggestions of the local authorities. A letter from "Box B," signed by the President of the church, is accepted as a call of God. This call to missionary service may be inconvenient, but it has the authority of a military order or a civil subpoena. Refusal to respond or obey would be disloyalty and would cloud any hopes the conscript might have of ecclesiastical or civil preferment. On the other hand, obedience to orders received from the mouthpiece of the church is a warrant to future favor. A generation ago a young business man in one of our larger Mormon towns received his call from "Box B." He was much more interested in business than in his inherited brand of religious faith, and his business plans were only well under way. As he announced his call to his young wife, he exclaimed: "I don't see how I can possibly leave you, the baby, and my business." "Well," said she, "I wouldn't do it." "But," said he, "I must go. If I refuse they will ruin me." He went, was put in charge of the financial management of an overseas mission, and

served his time. Since then he has received double for his obedience to orders. Another response to the call of "Box B" may illustrate its meaning as a test and testimony of clan solidarity. George ——— was more of a man about town than a churchman. One of his Gentile associates, hearing that his chum had received a letter from "Box B," rallied him, saying: "I hear that you are called on a mission. What! You a missionary? Are you going?" "Hell, yes," came the answer. "You fellows thought I wasn't a Mormon, but I am a sure enough Mormon to obey orders from headquarters."

In Mormon tradition the missionaries are not only called, but their fields are designated by revelation; but that these revelations are open to revision in certain cases is evident. A few years ago the revelators decided to call certain men of middle age on missions for six months. Among those who received revelations from "Box B" was an old employee of a prominent Salt Lake Gentile. He was quite willing to obey the call, provided his employer would give him leave of absence, but, being somewhat rheumatic, he bewailed the fact that he had been called to do house-to-house visitation in eastern Tennessee. He had hoped to be sent to southern California. "Of course," said his employer, "I'll hold your place open for you, and I feel sure that the authorities will, if you tell them the circumstances, send you to a more congenial climate." "But," said the prospective missionary, "Apostle ——— told me that my field was designated by revelation." The employer, who was well acquainted with the apostle in charge of the mission calls, then took the matter in hand and called at headquarters. As he entered the apostle's office he was effusively thanked for his readiness to release his

employee. "But," he interjected, "James is not able to do foot work in the Tennessee mountains. He wishes to go to southern California." The apostle's face lengthened as much as possible as he turned to his book of revelations and said, "I'm sorry, but the revelation calls James to Tennessee." "Oh," said the intercessor, "you as a friend of mine can change that revelation, can't you?" The apostle took up his pen, scored out "Tennessee," inserted "southern California," and, relaxing his face, chortled: "See, it is done." If he had known the last word in the new Oxford dictionary, he might have said, "Zyxt."

The Mormon missionaries, save the men in charge, do their missions at their own expense and are supposed to travel without purse or scrip. This merely means that they, their families, and the saints of the dispersion or such hospitable Gentiles as may give them a lift must care for these seekers after proselytes. The ward to which they belong usually gives them a "benefit" of songs, speeches, and dance and puts enough in their pockets to pay their fares to the field. The church, having ordained them to the Melchizedek priesthood and bound them to secrecy and obedience by covenants taken in the temple, gives them such endorsement as its ministers as will enable them to secure clergy rates from the railway companies. Many of the missionary suzerainties have central mission houses or homes where missionaries can obtain lodging at reduced rates. When "tracting," visiting or holding meetings in villages or towns at a distance from the mission house, the missionary must live on the community and on aid received from his wife, parents or relatives. This aid, as suggested by the *Missioner's Manual*, will likely be from \$20 to \$50 per month. The Christmas issue of *The*

Deseret News informs us that this money is sent by parents and relatives through a department in the church office building of Salt Lake City. So, "without purse or scrip," now means without support from the church tithing fund.

President Grant estimates that the missionaries sent out cost the church and the families of the missionaries over \$800,000 each year. The parents of some of these young men consider this estimate low, and some of them are questioning, Why this hit or miss conscription of our sons and daughters for missionary service? Why require them to do mission work at their own charges or expect us to pay their way? Why shouldn't the church assure its missionaries at least a living?

Yet the young men and women often accept their mission appointments with alacrity; they look upon a proposed mission of twenty months or two years as an escape from the monotony of the Mormon village or ranch, or as an interesting adventure; they appreciate the opportunity to visit in one or other of our great cities, and even more, if they are of foreign ancestry, a call to visit the land of their forebears. What if the two years' mission does eat up any moneys one may have inherited or saved or eat into the income or savings of his family? What if he must sometimes walk on his uppers or travel in the steerage or in third class cars? Do not other young men endure such hardships to see the world? As for the expense, do not other young men and women often invest all their resources in securing an education? Do not parents support their sons and daughters at school or college, or make it possible for them to see a bit of the world before they settle down? So it is common for the more alert class of ex-missionaries to say: "My two years' mission was worth what

it cost me and my family by way of discipline and general education." More serious and religious young people accept their missions on conventional terms. They go as propagandists, not to receive but to give; not to absorb through contacts, but to inject by impacts; these young men and women seek proselytes and are the out-reaching hands and finding fingers of the Mormon Church; they give the best they have to the best they know.

The great majority of those conscripted and sent are in their later teens or early twenties; some are just out of high school or college; many have only had casual contact with the elementary schools of their village or community. Some of the men who are drafted are from the ranks of the newly wed. Young men who have some financial resources of their own or through their family connections are especially liable to sacerdotal conscription; others are sent on missions by way of getting them into line for ecclesiastical use as cogs in the church machine; and still others, whose habits are loose and whose interest in the claims of Joseph Smith as a prophet is waning or wanting, are sent on missions in the hope that their discipline as exemplary products of the Mormon system and their necessary defense of its claims may chasten their conduct and stiffen their faith.

Many of the young missionaries are so used to using theological language out of place and to hearing it so used by their high priests, even their prophet, seer, and revelator and some of his apostles, that they find it difficult to denature their vocabulary. They can hardly tell a story with animation without using sulphurous expletives and comminatory adjectives. A few years ago, when traveling across the continent, a Protestant minister could not but overhear the cursing and swearing

of a group of young Mormon missionaries who were on their way to their mission field. Later he spoke of the matter to the older man who seemed to be in charge of the new missionaries. "Oh," said he, "the boys will have to quit that; they seem to forget that they are not back in Utah, but off on their missions."

As some of the young men are sent to chasten their coarse and profane habits of speech or to break up their evil or undesirable companionships, now and then one is sent to keep him out of jail. In other days Mormon apostles, when harrassed by the United States marshal by reason of their polygamous living, went on special missions to keep out of the penitentiary. Joseph F. Smith, late President of the Mormon Church, did time on such a mission in Hawaii. Heber J. Grant, now head of the hierarchy, went on such a mission to England. Other lawbreakers of this type had missions in Mexico and Canada.

It is only fair to say, however, that of the missionaries who are now drafted by the church, many are chosen from the more serious and sincerely religious young men and women of Mormonaria. Some of them go with what they accept as a personal testimony that Joseph Smith was and is a prophet; others go with a more or less eager desire and expectation that such a testimony will come to them as they obey the call of the mouthpiece of the church to which they belong. For the Mormon Church makes much of testimony. The "testimony" most desired is the testimony that Joseph Smith was a prophet of God, and that the church he founded is the church, and the only church, of Jesus Christ. Mormon propagandists acknowledge that very many of the missionaries do not have any such testimony when they are drafted for service. Brigham Young

frankly declared that young men were sent on missions, not because they had their testimonies, but that they might secure such evidential revelations. When he was fathering the organization of the first Mormon association for young women he said: "There is need for the young daughters of Israel to get a living testimony of the truth. Young men obtain this while on their missions, but the way is not open to the girls. More testimonies are obtained on the feet than on the knees."

We drop into the seat in a railway car with a youth of eighteen who is examining what seems to be a minister's license. As we talk it emerges that he has been taking a ten days' course of instruction at the mission house at Salt Lake City, and that the revelation by which he was called on his mission designated that he is to go to England. "Have you testimony?" we ask. "No," he answers, "but I am told that the testimony will come if I obey my call and preach the restored gospel." So the Mormon authorities apply the old Roman maxim, *Solvitur in ambulando*, or the promise of Hosea, "Then shall we know if we follow on to know."

This sending of young men who have no personal conviction, assurance or testimony, that the prophet and system they must defend are of God, troubles the more serious mission presidents and the little flocks over which they preside. At the recent conference one of these foreign leaders bewailed the fact that the missionaries sent to build up and increase his branch were not examples to the flock. "They have not lived up to the experiences and the standards of our converts," said he. "Missionaries come to us who frankly confess that they have no testimony, that they have not paid their tithes, and that they have not kept the Word of Wisdom as regards the use of intoxicants, etc. Send us men who

know by personal experience the truth of the gospel they preach and who have at least been trying to live up to the standards set by the laws of our church."

Returned missionaries not infrequently testify as regards their reception of the expected testimony while on their mission. One has had his first vivid experience of unconditional surrender to a living and loving God, and accepts it as a witness of the Spirit that the special claims of Joseph Smith are true. Another has had a notable experience of escape from imminent disaster or death, and cites it as evidence that Joseph Smith is a prophet and his teachings worthy of acceptance as inspired by God. Sometimes the supposed testimonies are based on visions or dreams. The expectation and exploitation of such testimonies is endemic in Mormonaria. The stuff of which these dreams are made is suggested and colored by Mormon tradition. But, whether connected or not with the special teachings and claims of Joseph Smith, these visions of the night are accepted as evidence that he was a prophet.

Not a few get flashes of "emotional certainty" as they muster and fling out their resources of feeling and will in the defense of the faith delivered to them by their fathers. As Brigham Young foretold, they get their testimonies, their cocksureness, on their feet as they make and pour forth assertions rather than on their knees as they pray. Such experiences may be and often are real, though the inferences made are invalid. That help and peace come to the pilgrims of the night as they call upon God is no testimony to the validity of Joseph's claims, nor is the deliverance of the missionary from this or that peril or his experience as he lays on hands for the healing of the sick any better endorsement of Joseph's inspiration. For the healing of the sick

the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man may avail much though the man may never have heard of Joseph Smith, or, having heard of him, may be sure beyond a reasonable doubt that he was a false prophet.

The number of missionaries sent out by the church each year is usually overstated by outsiders. Accepting the report of President Grant, that last year his organization had 2,026 propagandists at work or commissioned for service in fields outside of Mormonaria, it is to be remembered that as the average missionary serves about twenty months only about 1000 new ones need be drafted yearly. Moreover the missionaries frequently fail to fill their terms. The President of one of the largest and easiest missions of the Mormon Church reported at the recent conference that his force was so depleted by the unemployment and financial stress of the families represented that many of his missionaries had been obliged to return home, and that if the depletion continued at the present rate his missionary force would be cut in two by the end of the church year. The number of missionaries called out and commissioned at present largely exceeds the number at work on the mission field.

In an article published in *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW* for July, 1929, some of the essential doctrines of the Mormon Church were set forth, and it was intimated that some of these doctrines or teachings were wasting away, and that others were being modified. The spokesmen of the church did not resent the writer's statement of Mormon doctrines, but did resent any suggestion of the idea that the church was changing or could change by ceasing to preach its peculiar tenets.

The editor of the *Liahona*, the missionary magazine of the church, appeals to his co-workers, saying: "My

testimony unto you, my brethren and sisters, is that I know that there has been no change in the doctrines of the church. I have read the writings of the early elders of the church in the days of the Prophet Joseph and those who were with him. I have read many of the sermons recorded in the Journal and Discourses and other histories that were kept and are now in existence; and I have never found any change."

In the *Centennial History* of the Mormon Church recently published, with the imprimatur of President Grant, we read: "The doctrines of Mormonism are indispensable to its system. Mormonism must be wholly accepted or wholly rejected. Its doctrines and the whole-hearted acceptance of them are indispensable to membership in its system. The miraculous visions of Joseph Smith, the miraculous visitation of Moroni, the miraculous translation of the Book of Mormon, and the fact of direct and continuous revelations from God,—all must be accepted or Mormonism can have no standing, nor can anyone have a standing in Mormonism without acceptance of these doctrines. If they are altered or rejected in any particular, the system must collapse."

Nevertheless, Mormonism is changing, not only in a "convenient silence and half-concealment of facts," but in the new emphasis given to the doctrines wherein it most nearly agrees with the Christian church. Moreover, its attitude towards thinking has changed since it disciplined W. H. Chamberlain for thinking his way out of its materialistic philosophy. It has also abandoned its emphasis on its claim that Independence, Missouri, or Salt Lake City is to be the New Jerusalem or headquarters for the millennium. It is now advocating the diffusion rather than the congestion of the Saints.

The most conspicuous development of missionary service is that which is now being magnified at the gates or inside of the temple, especially the great temple of Salt Lake City. The most notable revival of missionary work inside the church is the revival of mission work for the dead. President Grant is urging this work as his father, Jedediah, urged the fanatical reformation movement of 1856-1857. Apostle Richards, President of the Salt Lake temple, has recently suggested that Saints who are unable to do proxy work for their ancestors employ good Mormons who are unemployed to do this proxy work for them. "Thus," said he, "you can serve both the living and the dead."

Yes, the Mormon leaders, if not the Mormon people, are bent on maintaining the distinctive principles of their cult and on propagating or clearing a way for, the preaching of the gospel according to Joseph Smith to all the children of Adam, be they living or be they dead.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

EXEGETICAL

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF PRIVILEGE

AMOS 1-3:2

By ANDREW R. OSBORN

IT IS PART of God's method of revelation in the Scriptures that different writers emphasize different aspects of divine truth. It was the task of Amos to burn into the hearts of his hearers the fact that sin brings inevitable doom. From this doom there is no escape. His words convey a sense of awe and dread that reminds us of Greek nemesis. Take, for example, the simple but powerful imagery in Amos 5:19. It is as if a man flees from a lion only to meet a bear. In terror he runs into a house, and panting leans his hand against the wall, only to be bitten by a serpent.

That the prophecy is to tell of retribution is indicated at the beginning. Just as modern poets frequently present the theme of their work at the outset by suggestive imagery, so Amos indicates the theme of his prophecy in a four-line stanza, in which the first line is linked to the third and the second to the fourth, thus providing an interesting example of parallelism:

Jehovah from Zion doth roar,
And from Jerusalem utters his voice,
And the pastures of the shepherds mourn,
And the top of Carmel withers.

Two images are linked here, that of the lion springing on its prey and that of the lightning flash withering the green top of Carmel. Both suggest immediate,

overpowering doom. The Hebrew word for "roar" is especially used of the lion as he springs on his prey. The roar means that he has already sprung; already the pastures of the shepherds mourn for the sheep killed. Even more immediate is the destruction wrought by lightning. The expression "utters his voice" calls up the image of the thunder clap and the lightning flash, as the trees are struck and withered. By means of these vivid metaphors Amos conveys to his hearers the idea that swift and sure retribution is upon those who have sinned against God.

The whole prophecy reveals the dynamic personality of the writer, who has justly been described as one of the most wonderful appearances in the history of the human spirit. Amos in his home at Tekoa lived with his sheep beneath the silence of the starry skies, but from time to time he left his lonely life to mingle with the caravans traveling north to Samaria. Thus he learned the news of the great world outside, and in this way he saw for himself the corruption brought by sudden wealth following the development of trade. In prophetic vision he saw that the end was ruin. His words were only too true, for, some thirty years or so after he uttered them, Samaria had fallen, and the Northern Kingdom had ceased to be.

Let us try to imagine this dynamic human figure, thin and spare in appearance, clad in shepherd's garb, as he bursts upon the gay assemblage at Bethel, chanting his monotone of doom.

For three transgressions of Damascus,
And for four,
I will not turn it away,
Because they have threshed Gilead
With threshing instruments of iron.

Damascus and Syria were the old enemies of Israel, and the sin here condemned is that of acts of frightfulness performed during the border warfare. The Eastern threshing wagon consists of a wooden frame, or drag, with sharp flints or iron underneath to tear the grain as it is driven over it. Some think that the Syrians had actually driven such instruments over rows of prisoners. Otherwise we have a metaphor conveying a picture of appalling cruelty. Can such cruelty go unpunished? Amos says no, and history confirms his verdict. We think of such things as the cruelties in France and Russia practiced by kings and emperors, of Turkish atrocities, of the Belgian Congo. A modern prophet of the nineteenth century might have taken up the old refrain and applied it.

‘For three transgressions of Turkey,
And for four,
I will not turn it away.’

Mr. Gladstone coined the phrase “the unspeakable Turk,” whose sin was that of Damascus and Ammon combined. Without doubt Turkey had committed three transgressions, even four; its wrongdoing was ripe and overripe for oncoming doom. It seems hard to associate the heroic Belgium of 1914 with the atrocities on the Congo. Yet it is a fact that in 1903 the indignation in Britain was so strong against King Leopold of Belgium that King Edward VII informed Belgian representatives that everyone in England had pronounced unanimous and strong opinion, and that he held Leopold to blame. We do not like to suggest that in the divine order of retribution there was a linkage between the atrocities on the Congo and the events of the Great War.

In order to grasp the prophetic message and the

argument, chapters one and two should be read rapidly, attention being given to the crimes and threatened doom rather than to detailed references. The crime of Syria was frightfulness; those of Tyre and Philistia were connected with heartless practices of the slave trade; Edom showed pitiless enmity; Ammon was guilty of atrocities; the sin of Moab was either gross cruelty or more probably impious disregard of the sacred. Upon each one, the prophet declares in vivid dramatic imagery, the judgment of God will come, and his burning words, which the high priest declared the land could not bear, set forth the eternal law of righteousness for all generations.

But the argument of the prophet does not stop at condemnation of the atrocities of surrounding nations. These judgments are but preparatory to his message to Judah and Israel. Let us try to grasp that message by continuing our modern parallels. May we venture to say that there are two modern nations, whose sentiments in regard to liberty and mercy are in advance of those of others? Britain and the United States of America stand together in a unique way for both. Has the message of Amos any meaning for them?

In the days of the prophet Judah and Israel stood on a higher level than their neighbors. They are not charged with atrocities or with ruthless warfare. The sin of Judah is disobedience to the law of God; that of Israel is greed for riches with callousness towards the poor and the break-down of morality. In other words, the sin of Israel was that of capitalism and wealth unrestrained by the laws of morality and the commands of God. Is this sin to be compared with ruthless savagery? Were Judah and Israel on a higher plane than their neighbors? Are Britain and the United States on a

higher plane today? We do not try to answer the question, but point to the words of Amos. Both Israel and Judah are guilty before God, and both must suffer. The burden of their wrongdoing rests on the heart of God as sheaves press upon the cart that bears them. Judgment is therefore inevitable.

Then at the beginning of chapter 3 Amos gives his final argument. Israel may plead that it is God's people. That is true, but they misinterpret the implications of the fact. They think that because they are God's people they will escape; on the contrary, because they have had greater privileges, they must expect more certain judgment. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities." These are words we do not like to take to ourselves; nevertheless it is true that divine retribution is as much a reality today as it was in the eighth century B.C. Also *noblesse oblige*; rank imposes obligation; higher privilege demands higher attainment.

NEW YORK.

HEBREWS 4:11-13

By HOWARD T. KUIST, PH.D.

LET US therefore give diligence to enter into that rest. . . .
For the word of God is living, and active. . . .

WHEN Hebrews 4:12-13 is read with the preceding verse, from which it is usually severed, the whole passage glows with its true sense and full meaning. The church Fathers, beginning with Eusebius, incorrectly applied the epithet "word of God" to the Incarnate Word, just as the word *λόγος* is correctly applied in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel to the Son. They doubtless were led to interpret the phrase under the influence of Revelation 19:13, "And his name is called The Word of God," or they considered the living word of this passage as equivalent to "the Word of life" in 1 John 1:1.

The broader scope of the author's treatment, however, will not allow this. True it is that he has begun his eloquent Epistle with the magnificent prelude, "God . . . hath . . . spoken. . . ." And this final Revealer, the Son, in whom He hath spoken, constitutes the center of interest in chapters one and two. He indeed is God's final word to man. But, as one's mind sympathetically follows the trend of thought in the third and fourth chapters, it becomes clear that the author's language presents what God has spoken under a somewhat different aspect.

When these chapters are read with our passage in view, then the living word of 4:12 becomes at once a spoken and a heard word. The phraseology of speak-

ing and hearing, repeated over and over again in these two chapters, all deliberately contributes to the significant idea of harmonious identification between God and the believer, which finds its ultimate consummation in 4:11-13. Take for instance 3:7, "Wherefore, even as the Holy Spirit saith, To-day if ye shall hear his voice, Harden not your hearts"; or 3:15, "while it is said, To-day if ye shall hear his voice, Harden not your hearts"; or 4:7, "saying in David . . . To-day if ye shall hear his voice, Harden not your hearts." (See also 4:4, 8.) And finally in 4:2, "the word of hearing did not profit them, because it was not united by faith with them that heard."

By the time the thoughtful reader has reached 4:12-13, therefore, his mind has already been prepared to apprehend the full force of the appeal to diligence in 4:11, and the corresponding reason for it in 4:12. "Let us therefore give diligence. . . . For living is the word of God." Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. The order of the Greek terminology is significant, for it reveals the author's emphasis—"Living is the word of God, and active. . . ." This word is suited to the end for which it is uttered. God is calling, as He always has called, those who would be identified with Him to a superior type of life, by a word instinct with His own life. His rest is available only to those who share His life, and His life with all His attributes is expressed in His word.

Is it any wonder then, that the author piles up metaphors to describe the effective working of this revelation which is God's word to man? The readers are urged to enter inasmuch as God's word enters! This living word of God enters into, "permeates, transforms, every element in man." These people, like Israel of old, may

neglect God's living word, but they may be sure that it will not neglect them. They are accountable for their attitude. They may well give heed, for "with God as judge they stand in relation" (*πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος.*—Heb. 4:13. Cf. Thayer). "For if the word spoken through angels proved steadfast . . . how shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation?" One can almost hear this warning of 2:3 re-echoed as he arrives at the conclusion of this searching passage.

God's word, then, is a living word, because it is a spoken and a heard word. The disclosure of the divine heart is not complete until it finds a corresponding response in the human heart. God speaks. Man hears. And the consequent fellowship, involving vital union of the hearer with the word is rest.

"Let us therefore give diligence to enter into that rest. . . . For the word of God is living, and active."

And I smiled to think God's greatness
flowed around our incompleteness,
Round our restlessness, his rest.

NEW YORK.

THE REVIEW

PRESENT THEOLOGICAL VIEWS

THERE ARE SIGNS that the old debate concerning natural and revealed religion may be revived. This was the issue which called forth Butler's *The Analogy of Religion*. Butler's argument was not in proof of the existence of God, for that was considered proved by the arguments of natural religion, but to maintain the reasonableness and necessity of revealed religion.

Today we are emerging from a deadly conflict with naturalism, and our attention is being directed to teleology and intuition. With increasing confidence the arguments of the eighteenth century in support of natural religion are being revived in modern guise. A decade ago it was customary to speak of Paley as out of date; now it is being said that his argument was in its essence right. Is it then possible for scientific thought or for a philosophy based on scientific data not only to afford certainty in regard to the existence of God, but also to demonstrate His ways with men? The writings of such men as Eddington, Thomson, Millikan, and Jeans have given religious thinkers a new confidence. A certain divine in England in a prayer over the radio even thanked God for the revelation He had vouchsafed through His servant Jeans. There is no reason to suppose that he wished to put Jeans in the place of Jesus, but the question inevitably arises, just as it did in the days of Butler, If natural religion can assure our faith, is there any necessity to press the claims of Christianity to be a revealed religion or to affirm its absoluteness? Around this inquiry debate is again beginning to concentrate.

In the first place we owe a debt of gratitude to that band of thinkers, who by their writings have overthrown the con-

fidest statements of naturalism, which was the dominant scientific philosophy of the nineteenth century. By naturalism is meant any view of the world that excludes the supernatural or spiritual. It is synonymous with materialism and atheism. Arnold Lunn, in his book, *The Flight from Reason*, says it is "atheism in evening dress" (p. 153). Those who wish to have a clear and readable statement of what he calls the "bankruptcy of naturalism" will find it in Mr. Lunn's book. It is of the first importance to religion to know that naturalism is bankrupt, for it has proved itself not only the enemy of the churches, but of morality, in short of all those values upon which our civilization is based. It is part of Mr. Lunn's argument that, so far from naturalism being based upon reason, its thought was enslaved by the conception of mechanism.

"The militant rationalist was usually a well-meaning but muddle-headed man. The much advertised austerity of his own private life was a tribute, as he failed to realise, to the Christian tradition which he was doing his best to destroy. His artless belief that the Christian code would survive the Christian creed was sustained by a mystical confidence in the common sense of mankind, that common sense which prevents mankind from taking the rationalist very seriously. The rationalist, though he devoted all his energies to proving that men were no better than the beasts, would have been startled and surprised had mankind begun to behave like beasts. It was because his own muddled code bore no relation to his own muddled creed that he assumed that a similar divorce between creed and code would prove a permanent feature of any society which rejected supernaturalism." (P. 163.)

There is a confident vigor in this attack, which in itself is evidence that the initiative has now passed from the rationalist to the Theist. Haeckel and his school no longer have standing. They cannot even appeal as before to belief in science, for "theism alone can vindicate the idealism of science, and alone can provide a reasoned basis for that mysticism which is the true inspiration of scientific research" (*ibid.*, p. 183).

It is interesting to note that the scientific defenders of religion are divided into two schools, one tending to mysticism

and intuition, and the other emphasizing teleology. Eddington and Jeans are mystics; Millikan is impressed by the order in the universe and in those spheres of value which constitute the bases of civilization. There is however no essential difference in their contentions, for all are persuaded that the universe is not a machine, but that its ultimate meaning is spiritual. There is nevertheless a special importance attaching to the conception of teleology, for this is essential to the Christian view of God, and it makes little difference whether the argument is stated in the exact modern statement of Dr. F. R. Tennant or the more easily grasped form of Paley.

Paley began his argument by supposing that in crossing a heath he pitched his foot against a stone, and were asked how the stone came to be there. He might answer that, for anything he knew to the contrary, it had lain there forever. If, however, instead of a stone he had found a watch on the ground, he would scarcely think of answering as he had done before, for the mechanism of the watch proved that "its several parts are framed and put together for a purpose." The evidence of purpose and design in the universe, in Paley's judgment, involved belief in the existence of God. The details of Paley's argument will not do for modern thought, but the main conception is being revived on all sides, now that materialistic evolution, or naturalism, is bankrupt. But if we affirm teleology in nature we must also affirm it in history. Philosophically this means a new interest in the philosophy of history; theologically it means revival of belief in a divine plan of redemption and of divine decrees.

It seems then that we are on the way to a revived faith in natural religion. Shall we repeat the error of the eighteenth century and declare revealed religion to be unnecessary? It is interesting to note that, after the first enthusiasm for the new scientific declarations a note of warning is creeping in, and, strange to say, it is coming from several quarters at the same time. One criticism of the opinions of the eminent scientists we have referred to is that, after all, the interpretation

they give comes from their personal religion and not from the facts of science. Jeans is a Platonist, Eddington a mystic, and they bring their religious philosophy into their interpretations. If this be so then the validity of their conclusions depends on the truth of their philosophy, which has other sources than those of pure science. Other men with a different philosophy interpret the same facts in a different way.

In the *Journal of Philosophical Studies* for January of this year there is an unusual and most interesting article on Biological Deism, by J. Needham. Dr. Needham says that instances occur in modern biology which can easily be made to fit in with philosophical and even theological ideas. His first example belongs more to astronomy than to biology. It deals with the fact that man is insignificant in comparison with the universe. Our earth is a planet revolving round the sun, which is itself only one of millions of stars. "All this," remarks Dr. Needham, "is now a commonplace, but what is not so well understood is the fact that modern astronomy tends, in a certain sense, to return to the pre-Copernican position, not of course as asserting the earth to be the centre of the universe, but as concluding that celestial bodies anything like the earth are extraordinarily rarely found in space" (p. 31). The biologist of the nineteenth century was inclined to believe that life such as we know might exist on many of the planets; the twentieth century biologist knows otherwise. As Alfred Russell Wallace pointed out several years ago, the conditions under which a planet such as our earth can come into existence and the conditions under which life can exist are so complicated that we may reasonably doubt whether there is any being resembling man in any other section of the universe. As Jeans says, "only an infinitesimally small corner of the universe can be in the least suited to form an abode of life."

If, then, man is such a unique creation may he not have a worth similar to that accorded him in the days before Copernicus? Then there is the old problem of determinism. The machine science of the last century had no room for free will,

but modern science is not so confident. Dr. Needham outlines a rather technical discussion, from which he draws the conclusion that, while in microscopic phenomena the principle of determinism is "for all intents and purposes complete and trustworthy . . . we cannot ascribe a similar regularity to events in the ultra-microscopic field" (p. 35). He concludes that "in this field events occur which appear to be free" (p. 36). Finally, from considerations of genetics, he points out that new biology may entertain the idea of the human self as an entity existing independently of genes and gene combinations. "The question is therefore still open as to whether philosophers and theologians might not choose to accept doctrines with which the biology of the nineteenth century would have nothing to do" (p. 39).

From such arguments as these Dr. Needham thinks it might be possible for some to construct what he calls "biological deism." Having demonstrated this, he proceeds to say that he personally is against it. In the first place, it must always be borne in mind that the scientific interpretation, whether favorable or unfavorable to religion, may be wrong. Religion does not rest upon science. The Deism of the eighteenth century was a failure, and twentieth century Deism will be a failure too. "Deism is the attempt to make religion scientific, an attempt which is foredoomed to failure" (p. 42). Therefore, while we need both biology and religion, "biological deism . . . can never be more than a barren stirring together of immiscible opposites" (p. 42).

In arriving at this conclusion Dr. Needham is, of course, expressing nothing more than his own individual opinion; but, whether we agree or disagree with his conclusions, he has pointed out a fact which is of importance for theological thought, namely, that religion is not founded upon science. The real value of the arguments of scientists who have recently come forward in support of religion is rather in the field of apologetics than in that of systematic theology proper. Scientific materialism, or naturalism, attacked the very foundations

of religion and morality. The proud boast of the scientist was that he had proof for everything he said, whereas the theologian was dependent on faith, if not on superstition. Now it has become clear that the supposedly proven facts are not proven at all, and that among the various theories of the universe which scientific philosophy may bring forward, the spiritual is the only complete and satisfactory one. It is the business of the theologian to master the main facts in the argument, so that he may be able to defend his faith against attacks made on scientific grounds; otherwise he gains little from them except liberty to go joyously about his own business.

It is worth while in this connection to remember the historic position of the church in regard to the arguments for natural religion. Systematic theology, as it was built up by such men as Aquinas and afterwards by the Reformers, took the position that there could be no real conflict in different forms of truth. They recognized both natural and revealed religion, and were prepared to co-ordinate with their theological systems truths revealed by human reason. They affirmed, however, that revealed religion held the primacy. In other words the discoveries of man's intellect might supply form and add content to the truths of revelation, but in no circumstances must revelation be subordinated to them. It is true that upon occasion the church has applied this principle in an arbitrary and mistaken way, but the contention is right and valid. It is therefore no reproach to Eddington or any other scientist to say that his religious belief colors his scientific interpretation. On the contrary this is as it should be.

If, then, theology received a setback in the nineteenth century because of the false scientific thought of the age, we may anticipate a revival in the twentieth, as men recover the spiritual viewpoint and believe once more in the living God. As a preliminary to such a revival we may expect in the near future a renewed interest in the possibility and reality of a special revelation of God to man, and therewith in the truth of Christianity as the absolute religion.

ANDREW R. OSBORN.

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

"ONLY TRANSFORMED MEN CAN TRANSFORM THE WORLD."—*The Expository Times*.

"To some, life is a wild ride; to others, it is an august pilgrimage."—*The Churchman*.

"Democracy has not failed. The intelligence of the race has failed before the problems the race has raised."—*President Hutchins of Berea College*.

"Who remembers to-day all the sage reflections which were roused in our fathers by the panics of 1876, of 1893, of 1907, of 1921?"—*André Maurois in The Forum*.

"Zionism stripped of religion, the Zionism of an atheist, is an anomaly, a contradiction, an incomprehensible absurdity."—*Dr. Angelo S. Rappoport in the History of Palestine*.

"The universe is not a permanent structure. It is living its life, and travelling the road from birth to death, just as we all are."—*Sir James Jeans in The Stars in Their Courses*.

"The Christian man of intelligence never lightly sneers at the philosopher, and on the other hand guards against swallowing him whole."—*John Sheridan Zelie in The Christian Advocate*.

"Along with the various technical and business engineers are being requisitioned a reasonable proportion of civilization-engineers, experts on things in general and humanity in particular."—*Chancellor Flint of Syracuse University*.

"Jesus, though He spoke little about 'seeing God,' brought God more vividly before the spiritual eyes of His contemporaries than any other has ever done. He gave a vision of God where others could only speak of it."—*Dr. Kenneth E. Kirk in The Vision of God*.

"Whenever the author of an obviously fine work is quite unknown, it readily becomes clear that the work, which must now be considered purely in itself, can yield but slight indications of the actual character of its creator."—*Dr. J. E. Turner in The Revelation of Deity*.

“Only one phase of our modern life gives me any feeling of alarm. That is the rate at which the wealth of the country is accumulated in the hands of fewer and fewer individuals.”
—*Dr. Charles W. Baldwin, only survivor of the Yale class of 1861, as quoted in The Lutheran.*

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE HAS ITS OWN PECULIAR LANGUAGE, ONE with a convincing quality that strikes the hearer like a voice of final authority, with a commanding moral tone not heard in other utterances. It has the singular distinction of carrying in itself the conviction of its authenticity, of needing no confirming witness, of giving the hearer the “immediate awareness” of divine truth. Because of this it brings assurance to the sincere inquirer and comfort to the believer.

But what is this language of Christianity? It was recently defined by Lord Eustace Percy, formerly British Minister of Education, in an address before a church congress upon The Bible in Education. *The Sunday School Times* has given this significant excerpt:

“The Bible is the language of the Christian faith, the only common language that the Christian Church has ever used. The Christian Church has a message to deliver to the world, but a message can only be delivered in a living language. A confusion of tongues has fallen on the Church, and her members speak in loose phrases which might fit a dozen meanings, in terms that are indeterminate and in definitions that do not define. We no longer preach Christ crucified, but ‘the principle of the Cross’; redemption and regeneration are swallowed up in a process of spiritual development; the gospel itself is converted into ‘the New Testament ethic.’ From this strife of tongues we, and the coming generation whom we are teaching in our schools, can only escape by returning to the Bible and learning again the free speech that our fathers used.”

THE MORAL TEACHINGS OF JESUS HAVE NEVER RECEIVED greater recognition than they do today. Men are calling upon one another to obey His precepts, not only within the church, but in business, in politics, in international affairs. All admire, no one disputes, His demands that men should be peaceable,

unselfish, self-sacrificing, loving. The great and fatal weakness in all such preaching is that it ignores the vital fact that human nature, unaided, is incapable of maintaining such a standard as the Lord sets. Yet we have a class of preachers who admonish people in all these lofty principles of being and of living with the same easy assurance they might use in directing a traveler, at the point where his road forks, to turn to the right or left.

The sublime moral heights to which the Sermon on the Mount summons men mark it as the greatest of codes respecting human relationships. The overlooked fact is that it was not addressed to men generally, but to the disciples of Christ. The unsaved and unregenerate man cannot summon the moral power to carry out such a program. "Without me," says our Lord, "ye can do nothing." This incapacity to meet the requirements of the Sermon on the Mount without the strength that Christ alone gives is recognized by the great Japanese leader, Toyohiko Kagawa who, to quote from a paper by C. J. L. Bates in *The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought*, has said on this point:

"The Sermon on the Mount is the summit of morality. But unless we have the Cross, the Sermon on the Mount is nothing but empty words. In China we have many fine ethical teachings. In the teachings of Mencius and of Bok Su we have almost the essence of the Sermon on the Mount; and the Buddhist teaching of the Kegou Sect is very near the Sermon on the Mount. But they have no Cross. Mencius and Bok Su didn't die on the Cross. The depth of Christ's ethical teachings lay in His realization of His own teachings, and His triumph on the Cross. The Cross means many things, His victory over pain, His victory over sadness, His victory over death; His self-sacrifice, His courage in killing egoism. The altruistic principle is accomplished in the Cross of Jesus."

"Paul's ethical principle of suffering for the sake of Christ (Phil. 1:29, 'For you have been granted the privilege, not only of trusting in Christ, but of suffering for Him.') is really a great fundamental to Oriental Christianity. When we Oriental Christians can conquer pain, death, sorrow, and all evil for the sake of Christ, it means everything."

"Sorrow for one's own pain is real sorrow; but sorrow and suffering for others is a joy. This I learned when I was in the slums and again when I was in prison."

"In the crucifixion we have no mere 'social gospel.' In the crucifixion we have the gospel of God, and the gospel of humanity. In the crucifixion we find the truth of religion. We find there the Truth, the Life and the Way. But I tell you that the crucifixion is not a doctrine. It is a truth of life."

THERE IS AN INTOLERANCE THAT IS NOT NARROW. NO ONE OF healthy moral character can feel any patience toward the vile-ness and corruption that marks the administration of some of our cities today. How can such things be tolerated if life is to be safe and conduct decent in this country? "The capacity for high resentments" must be recovered by our citizenship before these evils are overcome. The same thing is true of the church. If loose theology and looser preaching are to be generally accepted, what sure and certain faith has the pulpit to offer men, except in the way of moral platitudes? In *Christian Faith and Life* Dr. Harold Paul Sloan makes this editorial demand for an old, and sound, intolerance:

"No man really loves truth who does not hate untruth. No man really loves righteousness who does not feel within him something of the wrath of God against sin. A conviction of truth and righteousness that is not intolerant of all that which is contrary is less than a conviction, and cannot be creative.

"Professor Macintosh quotes the great Harnack as saying, 'Neo-Platonism lacked the power of exclusiveness and of that lack it died.' Such tolerance is often praised, but in truth it entails a neutrality on moral questions that eventually is bound to poison the wells of life. 'Not a few Indian cults showed the same easy accommodations, partly for intellectual and partly for climatic reasons. How far otherwise it was with Judaism and Christianity. Both faiths stood based on history; both were moral to the core. In things of the spirit, both exhibited a noble and transigent jealousy, which is but one side of the loftiest personal conviction. Neither could for one moment have agreed to regard the highest good of man or the unity or character of God as open to question. These were matters for which at any hour the martyr might well die.'

"Christianity must recover again this earlier intolerance. It must distinguish between truth and untruth. It must maintain truth and oppose untruth; but it must learn to do this with a love as great as that love which the martyrs showed at the beginning, who, while they burned rather than compromise the glory of Christ yet burned, praying for those who persecuted them."

IT IS NOT WITHOUT SIGNIFICANCE THAT THE WORD DEFEATISM has come lately into frequent use. It seems a verbal coin struck for our times. It connotes the disposition to accept the worst as inevitable, and not only that, but to spread the virus of discouragement at a time when faith and hope and determination are the superlative need. Defeatism is found in business, in government, in social work, in the church. If things are to improve, defeatism must be stamped out, and those who indulge themselves in this sort of mental drug addiction ought to be marked as people to be avoided. An editorial in *The Christian Advocate* has put the matter none too strongly:

"When one looks frankly into the conditions of Christian discipleship as laid down by the various declarations of Jesus they seem impossible of fulfillment. Here is idealism seemingly beyond the reach of realization! Here are requirements that demand the presence of an element of divinity with its marvelous and limitless resources of resistance and achievement regnant within every individual who accepts the leadership of Jesus. But that element is there! What did Paul mean when he declared: 'I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me'? And what hidden meaning lies here: 'for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure'?"

"One of the fatalities of Christian discipleship lies in the subtle spirit of defeatism that lurks in many hearts, sapping them of courage and filling them with fear. Faith 'laughs at impossibilities, and cries, "It shall be done!"' while Fear cowers and cringes and wails, 'It can't be done.' If the note of triumph and jubilation is lacking in the life and testimony of the Church today, as many signs and portents seems to indicate, may it not be because this curse of spiritual defeatism lies upon it like a paralysis! Vast undertakings that ought to command the consecrated energies of the Church of God—in missions, in social betterment, in moral regeneration, in general human ad-

vancement and spiritual enrichment through the universal enthronement of our Lord and obedience to His teaching—are left undone, untouched, ignored because the spirit of defeatism has frozen the heart of the Church and turned its advance into a retreat and its pæan into a dirge!”

“The insidiousness and destructiveness of defeatism were recognized by General Pershing when they began to appear in all their ugliness in our army in France. Knowing the inevitable disaster that follows on the heels of defeatism, Pershing dealt with it instantly and vigorously, and administered a stinging rebuke to the offending officers in high command who were reported to have given the impression in careless conversation that our efforts in France were utterly futile and sure to suffer defeat. And he did not hesitate to add the threat of a severe penalty to his drastic reprimand.

“Jesus had a crushing word of condemnation for the faint-hearted and faithless disciple that has fitness for that disciple of the modern day who, being a propagandist of defeatism, obstructs the advancement of the Christian cause in the world: ‘No man,’ he said, ‘having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.’”

THERE ARE MANY PEOPLE IN THE CHURCH WHOSE RIGHT TO BE there cannot be denied, since they have a good profession of faith and habitually obey the moral law; yet they cannot be called exemplary Christians. Their religion is sincere, but not sufficient. It expresses itself for the most part in acts and conduct prompted by the finer emotions and sentiments, but has little of the judicial about it. Of course, this is true of human nature generally. Most of us do not use our intellects any more than we have to, but are governed by feeling and imagination, by likes and dislikes, by hopes and fears. The value of our Christian activity falls far short of its possibilities simply because we have never developed as we might our analytical, interpretative, and constructive powers.

There are probably many Christian people who, as far as is humanly possible, serve the Lord with the whole heart—with love, faith, adoration, but who seemingly have never discovered the importance of serving Him with the whole mind—with careful observation, judicial thinking, and well planned

activity. They are not sanctimonious, much less hypocritical; they have simply a one-sided psychological development. This does not mean a call for overbalanced religious intellectualism; it means that the proper attitude toward life demands that all the forces of our conscious life should be brought up to the proper standard.

Under the title "A Right Judgment in All Things," *The Churchman* gives this good counsel on the point we seek to make:

"It is unfortunate that the church has, since the Reformation, placed so little emphasis upon the aspect of Christian truth expressed in this phrase in the collect for Whitsunday. George Adam Smith, in his commentary on *Isaiah*, reminds us that both in the Old Testament and in the medieval church the Spirit of God was thought of as the inspirer of the intellect. Those who built the tabernacle and its furniture were especially inspired of God; the 'seven Spirits of God' with which the Messiah was to be endowed were 'prevailingly intellectual'; in medieval churches the Dove is represented as 'descending upon the heads of learned persons, or presiding over discussions, or hovering over groups of figures representing the sciences.' The commentator complains that our use of the word *Comforter* has made it difficult to associate the Holy Spirit with the stern rigor of the magistrate, or the scientific attitude of the laboratory, and regrets the modern corruption of the doctrine, one of which, the Catholic, 'emphasizes the Spirit's influence in the exclusive operation of the grace of orders,' and the other, the Protestant, 'dissipates it into the vaguest religiosity.'

"Perhaps there have been sufficient Whitsunday sermons preached on the miraculous birth of the Catholic Church, or even the equally miraculous success of the first missionary sermon. Might the church not have some on, for instance, 'The Moral Obligation to be Intelligent,' the title of an essay by John Erskine, his best literary production? What of 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy *mind*,' as a Whitsunday text? These are the days when the necessity for adult education is widely proclaimed. Might the preacher not warn us that at the Last Judgment, after the Judge has shown where we must suffer loss because we have refused to do what we knew to be His will, He may well point out this and that instance where we sinned because we would not 'use our heads'?

"The Anglo-Saxon ideal of the Christian, as Erskine points out, the hero of most of the popular novels, is the well-meaning fool with a good heart. What, asks he, would Plato have thought of Mr. Pickwick or the Vicar of Wakefield? We are thankful that a kind Father takes account of us according to that which we have, and not according to that which we have not. But we need to ask ourselves whether we have, in intellectual equipment, and in practical efficiency for the business of living, all the Holy Spirit of God might provide us with, if we would cooperate with His mental laws."

THE SUPREME AIM OF PRAYER CAN HARDLY BE TO PROVIDE escape from troublesome emotions by substituting others of an opposite kind. Nevertheless it has long been observed that prayer does bring to minds that are overwrought a peace and even clarity not found in any other way. The reason for this is quite within reach of our understanding, and Professor S. N. Stevens, of the department of psychology in Northwestern University offers an explanation, also an exhortation, in the Methodist press, touching both the natural and the spiritual benefits of devout prayer:

"Prayer involves practically every psychological requisite for overcoming nervous tension and its accompanying difficulties. One cannot pray on the run. Real prayer necessitates a temporary retreat from the welter of distractions known as our daily routine. It involves quiet, freedom from the pressure of sights and sounds which make up the buzzing confusion of our environment. When the need for complicated adjustments is missing, the entire body relaxes, and nerves and muscles have an opportunity to recuperate and renew themselves. The deep organic tensions on heart and viscera gradually disappear. The whole body regains its organic equilibrium and gets ready for a new attack when the need arises."

"Effective prayer is a successful method of resolving conflicts, whether they be emotional or purely intellectual conflicts. A very great business executive told the writer recently that whenever he was faced with a difficult problem, he went into his inner office, locked the door, and prayed. He claimed that praying, both as an act of devotion and as a method of problem solving, enabled him to see the problem in its total setting; and in laying it before his Maker, he was able to see it in terms

which were social and moral, as well as economic. He was aided in this way to deal morally and socially with his business problems with the consciousness of himself as an agent for a Power greater than he was to whom he was responsible."

THE GREAT TASK OF THE CHURCH IS TO EVANGELIZE THE WORLD. Like other important duties, however, it cannot be successfully performed as the result of a mere momentary impulse. Certain conditions must be met; otherwise the church can hardly look for an outpouring of the convicting and converting work of the Spirit of God. It is one thing to hold "protracted meetings," to organize an "evangelistic campaign" or to preach "revival sermons"; it is quite another to bring men to God through repentance and faith in the merits of the divine Saviour. It is not for us to determine the conditions under which the Spirit operates upon the hearts of men, but the history of great revivals certainly leaves the inescapable impression that they have their element of deep spiritual preparation, though sometimes it is not outwardly observable.

The importance of what precedes and follows evangelization has been emphasized by *The Religious Telescope*, using a statement by Dr. John R. Mott as a text:

"Here is a significant statement from a recent address by John R. Mott: 'Even more depends on what we do before we evangelize and what we do after, than on what we do when we evangelize. If I had to live my life over again I would spend vastly more in what precedes evangelistic work and in what follows than on what takes place in between. It is here that we are weak.'

"These words may seem strange to some. Others no doubt will find them in harmony with their own growing conviction. Evangelism cannot be made an isolated work. It roots itself into the entire life of the Church. Hence, it follows that to make direct evangelistic efforts fruitful and the fruitage permanent, the soil for that rootage must be kept in proper condition. Something must be done before, as well as after, if evangelistic effort is to prove satisfactory in any considerable degree. And, with John R. Mott, we aver that it is at this point that the greatest weakness lies.

"If the 'before' and 'after' are up to requirements, what 'takes place between' will occur quite naturally. Where a deep, rich, vigorous spiritual life prevails throughout the year, that in itself will be the most effective evangelistic force. The 'before' and 'after' and 'between' will then be blended together, and soul-winning will be a perennial functioning of the Church and a perennial experience. That should be the normal life of a congregation.

"It is a common lament that we lose so many members from year to year. We win converts and add to our membership roll, not too many, to be sure, but enough to make a healthy gain but for the fact that so many slip through the meshes back into the open. Allowing for all strictly legitimate losses, it must be admitted that many that must be dismissed each year would be conserved to the Church and the service of Christ, if they had found the right kind of soil in which to live and come to spiritual maturity. The 'before' and 'after' had been neglected, and that neglect annulled in large measure what occurred 'between.' "

THERE IS AN IDEA AMONG SOME MINISTERS OF OUR DAY THAT A "passion for souls" is an outworn motive for the ministry. Moreover, it seems to them something that, if they had it, would sadly disturb their pursuit of congenial studies, and would of necessity take them from the fine atmosphere of intellectualism into that of a feverish emotionalism. But it is a fact that, if a man throws his whole soul into any worthy work, however specialized it may seem in itself, he will unexpectedly find avenues of mental activity opening to him where he never expected them. Life is not made up of single, separate, unrelated activities; it is a fabric woven of threads of many rich colors.

The man of active mind who cheerfully obeys the summons to devote himself to proclaiming the Good News need not lack in intellectual development any more than a professor of philosophy. Indeed, if the importance of a well balanced, as well as a well stored, mind is kept in view, the chances are rather against the philosopher as these things actually work out. Take the case of Charles G. Finney. How many ambitious young men of his generation did as much as he for the

educational progress of this country? Yet, as *The Watchman-Examiner* outlines in this brief way his life, his one great motive was a passion for souls:

“When Charles G. Finney was a lawyer twenty-nine years of age he examined the claims of Christianity by a profound study of the Bible. His surrender to Christ followed and was so complete that he determined to abandon the practise of law that he might persuade others to accept his new found Saviour. The Bible was his guide. Studying this book with his keen and finely trained mind he developed his own theology. As an evangelist he swept over the land, preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ. Indifference to his own interests, a great passion for souls, an earnestness that aroused audiences to a white heat of emotion, a flawless and irresistible logic and a tremendous insistence that those who accepted Christ should live within his will, characterized his ministry. Friends in New York organized the Broadway Tabernacle Congregational church and persuaded him to become its pastor. Here he preached with great passion, making the church the center of a far reaching evangelical work. Later Dr. William M. Taylor became the pastor of that church, and still later Dr. Charles E. Jefferson. While Dr. Finney was in New York Oberlin College was started to prepare men of his type for the ministry. In time the work of this college was an irresistible call to the man who was at once an evangelist, philosopher and theologian. At Oberlin, as professor and president, he did the great work of his life. Students from all over the land flocked to this institution. He taught the profoundest subjects, but in the college and in all the surrounding country he continued to manifest his ‘passion for souls’ as he preached the gospel that saves the lost and keeps the saved. Would not college presidents with this ‘passion for souls’ be a blessing to our generation?”

THERE ARE CHRISTIAN LEADERS WHO WILL NOT BRING INTO THE pulpit certain doctrines in which they believe because it would almost certainly precipitate controversy and fanaticism if they did so. This disposition to make almost a separate religion out of some phase of Christianity has prevented rational and needed treatment of certain themes, among them the unfulfilled prophecies of the Bible. The promised future glorious appearing of our Lord has been so completely ignored in many pulpits

that multitudes of Christian people have no very clear idea of what it means. Yet where it is sanely and thoughtfully presented and simply given its rightful place in Biblical exposition, with strained interpretation and disproportionate emphasis omitted, it has been a source of spiritual development and inspiring hope. But so often has this doctrine been wounded in the house of its friends that in many places the preacher fears he would invite strife and division if he introduced it; so he simply ignores it.

But the prophetic, or more properly the predictive, parts of Christian truth ought not to be ignored. In many congregations there are people who are eager to know of these things, and if their own churches do not deal with them, they become tempting prey for some extremist sect. Discussing the prophetic note in the course of an article in *The Watchman-Examiner*, Rev. David Miller offers counsel that deserves attention:

“When we speak of the prophetic note we mean the predictive element that is to be found in the Scriptures. We are fully aware of the elimination of this element on the part of many, and the reasons given for it. But this is not surprising in a modern conception of the Bible which divests it of any supernatural character. The prophets of the Old Testament are viewed as religious statesmen who were in advance of their times. This explanation, however, will not satisfy an unbiased and unprejudiced mind. It is the result of bringing to the interpretation of the Scriptures a preconceived theory that excludes the supernatural element, and everything must be explained in reference to that theory.”

“Here it may be said that there seems to be an astonishing negligence on the part of modern preachers as to the study of Christ’s prophetic teaching. There is no part of it that is of greater importance than this, his utterances concerning this age, initiated by his first advent and to be consummated by his second. Here he is the prophet of the ages declaring in parable and symbol the history of the coming day. Surely we should not leave these vast tracts unexplored, for he still reveals his secrets to his servants the prophets, and discloses them to his friends. The promise that Christ has given concerning the Spirit is that ‘he shall show you things to come.’

That this has its bearing not only on our Lord's eschatological teaching concerning the destiny of the soul and the future judgment, but also on world movements is perfectly evident from his statements concerning the preservation of the Jewish race, the revival of their national life, and other matters pertaining to the nations. We cannot afford to be indifferent to such important utterances and their tremendous significance in the days in which we live and the light they are flashing on the meaning of current events."

"Our silence on such truths has led to the creation of Millennial Dawnism, Adventism and kindred cults that have gathered thousands to themselves who might have been in our churches.

"In answer to the question, Why should we preach it? it should be sufficient to say, because we are called on to declare all the counsel of God. That was Paul's solemn affirmation to the elders of the church at Ephesus. Speaking of his ministry there he said: 'I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.' That this prophetic note was included in his preaching no one conversant with his writings will question. They may think he was mistaken in his expectations, but not as to his preaching of it. May I seek to give an answer to this question by submitting three reasons:

"Because it exalts Christ. Let there be no doubt about this. Anything that exalts Christ should be proclaimed. The Bible is a Book of prophecy. It begins with prophecy and ends with prophecy, and every prophecy is connected with Christ. He is the seed of the woman and the Shiloh of Genesis, the paschal lamb of Exodus, the sin offering of Leviticus, the rock of Deuteronomy. He is the prophet, the priest, the king. To him give all the prophets witness. All the centuries move on in solemn procession to lay their tribute at Golgotha. The summing up of it all is seen in the expression in the Apocalypse of the Apostle John. The spirit of Jesus is the testimony of prophecy. We can gather all the teaching of the Book under three phrases concerning him: He is coming; he has come; he shall come. As all roads led to Rome, so all prophetic roads lead to Christ.

"It reveals the purposes of God. 'Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world.' He is not dealing with the human race in any accidental or chaotic fashion, but according to a divinely arranged plan."

NATURALLY WHEN THINGS GO WRONG IN THE CHURCH WORLD the preacher comes in for a good share of the blame. The responsibility often rests more justly upon the pew. However, ministers who are awake to the full meaning of their calling realize that there are preachers content to get things to running in a more or less comfortable groove, and to let it go at that.

A reference to "sloth in the pulpit," made a short time ago by a denominational committee, furnished *The Sun*, New York, a text from which it preached a sermon to preachers, and here are some bits of the comment and counsel it contained:

"Some churches, it is asserted, pay less attention to the spiritual qualities of a prospective pastor than to his worldly qualifications for getting results and making a good appearance.

"Others complain, in the words of one layman, that 'Not a new thought has been presented in that pulpit in twenty years.'

"There are ministers who cease to study as soon as they have accumulated stocks of sermons they can use over and over again as they drift about from place to place. Of these it is said that they find themselves sorely puzzled to understand why hearers have tired of their homilies, to discover themselves among those who are driven to 'burden their friends with complaints and excuses—often plausible, but not often honest—and with requests for assistance in securing new charges.'"

"There are weak churches and strong churches, weak preachers and strong preachers to-day, as there were in many previous ages.

"This, nevertheless, is a restless age, and an impatient.

"There never was a time when laziness was in greater disesteem.

"Moreover, the pastor who to-day undertakes to lead a flock must be prepared to meet severe tests of a kind often spared to his predecessors in other centuries.

"The printing-press and radio have brought to him greater mental competition, as they have given to his hearers better measuring wands with which to ascertain for themselves how he ranks intellectually and culturally. He needs courage, an alert mind, sound judgment, sure moral and spiritual insight, if he intends to go into the pulpit Sunday after Sunday and invite the comparisons his congregation is bound to make.

“Theological seminaries training young men for the ministry will do well to impress this fact on their neophytes from the start.”

MANY PEOPLE STILL LIVING REMEMBER WHEN CHRISTIAN PULPITS depended on the setting forth of the great truths of the Gospel to attract hearers, and the church on the conversion of sinners to supply members. There are such preachers and churches still, but they are not usually very prominent. The church has caught the commercial idea that success is vitally related to publicity. There has been developed a type of preacher chiefly known for striking methods of gaining public attention. The Saturday announcements of such a man attract superficial minds that are always alert to discover the latest sensation, but it is rarely recorded that the sermons these people hear are either impressive in thought and delivery or lasting in effect.

Robert G. M. Neville has published in *The Forum* a very drastic commentary on the itch for public attention that is making mere public entertainers, and even buffoons, of some preachers. He does not content himself with generalities, but deals with individuals, whom he names, and with performances which he describes. These passages, however, give more particularly his view of the situation at large—a situation that does not commend itself to those intent upon fulfilling the great obligation laid upon the ministry to preach Christ:

“The time can be recalled by living men when the virus of publicity had not bitten the average priest, rector, or divine; when there were no sermon pages on which his Sabbatical conclusions could be recorded for posterity; when no church committees on press relations pleaded with exasperated city editors for space, and when no handsomely paid publicity agents threatened withdrawal of advertising if the paper refused to exhibit curiosity in their clerical clients.

“But alas! that day has vanished. That was a time when churches, like physicians, disdained to spend huge sums of money to advertise their services in the mundane press. It was a time when the press, yet to be won over to the ways of God, refused to recognize that religion was as important as the

theater, sports, and finance, and to give it equal space. It was a time before modern high pressure methods had been invented, and before publicity, which started with the somewhat shady dealings of the circus, had found an unimpeachable and lucrative client in the representatives of God on earth."

"While the coverage of religious news is now a fever with almost every paper in every part of the country, the regard of the nation's press for religion—and of the pastors for the press—is epitomized by the situation in New York. The Mecca of missionaries from all ends of the earth, the parish of apostles of new religion by the score, and the headquarters of dozens of ecclesiastical organizations, this modern Gomorrah maintains a daily press obsessed with religious zeal.

"*The New York Times*, for example, finds it profitable to pay twenty-five reporters—many of them from the Columbia School of Journalism—\$3.25 apiece for worshipping on Sunday, besides maintaining a religious editor to ferret out religious happenings throughout the week. The *Herald Tribune*, which outprints the *Times* on sermons, sends out a group of men to invade the churches for news every Sunday and dispatches its staff of copy boys to fill in."

"This sudden bursting into hallelujahs by the Fourth Estate has been welcomed fervently by the ministers. Often they are ready with extracts of their moral dissertations to hand to the reporters, and more often they apprise the press in advance of any unusual happenings in their congregations."

"Ever vigilant, scanning religious columns with the eye of a hawk, the publicity agents, secretaries, and press committees intervene in person in the name of Church and God when their releases repeatedly fail to appear in print."

"Suspicious newspaper men have begun to believe that sermons are not preached for the salvation of a sinful humanity so much for exploitation by a wayward press and that some parish activities originate not so much out of a love of God as a penchant for publicity."

"There are some ministers, God bless them, who still ignore the press, and stick to the Gospel. There are others who profess to despise publicity but nevertheless contend that they must stoop to conquer, that the church must publicize itself to the fullest extent in order to compete with amusements. The skeptics at the press bench cannot help feeling, however, that the personal ambition of the men of God is the most potent factor in religious news. A divine who prefers to remain in

his parish and minister solely to his flock, never venturing into the wider world of the press, may conceivably enter the Kingdom of God with full honors, but he will never become a Park Avenue rector with a salary of \$20,000 a year, nor will he be elected a moderator or bishop."

IT IS ONE THING TO SPEAK OR WRITE ACCURATELY AND CORRECTLY; it is quite another to do so interestingly. This thing of expressing oneself in an interesting way is not a lost art—some have a natural gift for it, but it is a neglected art. Often a subject is important and timely, its presentation logical and conclusive, but somehow the sermon or address fails to hold the hearer; it is not interesting. This element of interest is more essential now than ever. When speakers, books, and periodicals were fewer, and the radio unheard of, and when people were hungry to hear and read, there was less danger of boring audiences and readers. Hungry minds would gnaw very dry bones. But now the article or book that does not hold attention is laid down, and perhaps the radio knob is turned with the hope of finding something attractive for overfed minds.

Dr. A. W. Plyler, editor of *The North Carolina Christian Advocate*, spoke with wisdom when, in an article in the Methodist press upon religious journalism, he gave this admonition:

"A short speech is not necessarily great, just as a long one is not necessarily great; but the one superb quality that on each and every occasion redeems the short speech is it never bores long-suffering auditors. Furthermore, the short speech is just as apt to be great as the long one. The Sermon on the Mount is not over twenty minutes. Abraham Lincoln's immortal speech at Gettysburg was less than 300 words. Not his long speeches but his short ones clothed Patrick Henry with an orator's immortality. It is said that a cub reporter told a great newspaper man that a certain incident could not be covered in a story of 600 words, and the great newspaper man replied: 'The whole story of the creation of the world in Genesis is covered in 600 words.'

"A writer if he holds his readers must learn to be both brief and interesting, for a reader can drop the story at the end of any sentence or paragraph if he loses interest in it or grows tired. But there is an unwritten law of polite society

which prevents a man from getting up and stalking out even if the speaker is boring with a big auger. The unfortunate auditors by the very conventions of life have to sit and take the punishment. Hence, upon the speaker rests a special call to show a humane spirit. But with the writer it is much more than manifesting a humane spirit, it is a necessity to be concise."

SOME OF OUR MODERN WAYS OF CARRYING ON CHRISTIAN WORK are so highly organized and complicated as to be discouraging to people who feel a strong desire to devote more attention to the interests of the Kingdom, but fear that their lack of special training disqualifies them. Yet often some of this class have not only native gifts suitable to such service, but also the enthusiasm and energy that are vital to success. Then, too, we hear so much about church "plant" and "equipment" that soul winning, Biblical instruction, and training in the essentials of the Christian life appear almost as though conducted on a factory basis.

These things all have their value, but they may be so overdone that the means obscure the end. In some of our church schools the machinery and the general scheme of things present the learning and teaching of Christian truth as a rather appalling task. Yet they do not need to be developed on any such forbidding lines. The rector of St. John's Church, Pre-emption, Illinois, Rev. T. M. Baxter, has given through the *International Journal of Religious Education* an account of the genesis of one rural vacation school. Its growth and the principles upon which it is conducted are both suggestive and encouraging:

"One summer some of the neighbor children came to the rectory once a week to play with the rector's children. After a number of such visits we felt that we might provide some activities which would prove to be of value in the children's religious training. The group responded readily and reported such happy times that soon other children of the community asked to be included. So the school began. The plan was continued throughout that summer and again the next year and by the third summer, three adult teachers and one assistant were sharing in the leadership responsibilities of this under-

taking. Although we referred to this enterprise as a 'school,' it really has never had a name. We call it by different names, such as the children's meeting, the children's guild, and the weekday school. We have intentionally kept it as informal as possible.

"Because it is difficult for rural children to meet every day during vacation time, it was decided to meet every Tuesday afternoon. Last year the work began early in June and closed late in August."

"The attendance and general response has been most encouraging. Our church school has an enrolment of twenty-five children—our weekday attendance seldom falls below twenty.

"This school which like Topsy had just 'growed,' has been an interesting experiment. It has been changed each season and we think always should be for we believe that the very informality and spontaneity of it has been one of the largest factors in its helpfulness and popularity. The evident needs and requirements of the children themselves have determined the nature of the program."

DOES OUR COUNTRY NEED A HEROIC AND SELF-SACRIFICING ministry with the courage of pioneers and the devotion of missionaries? All of these qualities are in general essential to the true preacher of the Gospel anywhere, but is there a field in America that peculiarly demands them? These items, from the *Record of Christian Work*, furnish a sufficient answer, even if there were no other:

"What the Home Missions Council calls 'the unescapable challenge of the unmet religious needs of the nation' is that there are in America today:

"10,000 villages without a church of any kind, Jewish, Roman Catholic or Protestant;

"30,000 villages without a resident pastor;

"13,400,000 children under 12 years of age who are receiving no religious instruction of any kind;

"More than one-half of the total American population unconnected with any institution representing organized religion."

However, there are some encouraging signs. We are beginning to search for the fundamental causes of our religious conditions and to be no longer content with treating symptoms.

Dr. G. L. Kieffer, who succeeds the late Dr. H. K. Carroll as the accepted church statistician in America, in commenting upon the latest figures as given in his report published in *The Christian Herald*, said:

"If the churches are losing ground, the reason and the remedy can be found in part in an analysis of the message they are proclaiming to the world. An age of doubt and question, of depression and lawlessness, demands from the pulpits of the land a clear, ringing statement.

"But there are not a few favorable signs. One is that there has been no decrease in the number of new churches. Another is that there has been a gain in the number of ministers. The younger ministers do not seem to be falling off, and it is from them that the church must expect the evangelistic appeal which it so much needs."

ONE OF THE GREAT, PERHAPS ONE OF THE CHIEF, DANGERS TO the endurance of American institutions is found in our immigration. When we remember that most of our foreign born people settle in our cities, and that, as go the cities so goes the country, and that we have for many years been admitting hundreds of thousands of least desirable aliens, then it is not so hard to account, in large part, for the lawlessness of places like Chicago and New York. The very names of many of our most notorious criminals are significant respecting the origin of a large proportion of our criminal class.

Moreover, the definitely criminal element to be found among our immigrants does not alone mark the peril. There are multitudes who follow honest callings for a living, but who nevertheless either have no particular respect for our institutions or actively oppose and seek to undermine them. We have been admitting foreigners much faster than we can assimilate them, so that now we have a major problem in these newcomers. Writing upon the immigration question in *The Lutheran*, Dr. Calvin P. Swank includes these passages that Christian Americans should take as subjects of thought and prayer:

"One of the apparent evils of past immigration, as we have intimated, comes from their concentration. In 1910,

while forty-two per cent of our general population was urban, seventy-two per cent of the foreign born had gravitated to these same city communities. Sixty-two per cent of all foreign born were in cities of 25,000 to 100,000; 29 per cent in cities of 100,000 to 500,000 and upwards. In fact over one fifth of the population of cities of 100,000 to 500,000; and nearly one third of the cities of 500,000 and over were foreign born. The highest percentage of urban population was shown by Roumanians (91.9) and Russians (eighty-seven per cent), both of whom were largely Jewish. Russia is the country of birth of the largest contingent of foreign born in New York City and Philadelphia. German born are most numerous in Baltimore, Buffalo, Chicago and Milwaukee. As a rule immigrants are attracted to a city where there already is a large number of their own nationality. Some of our cities and their percentage of foreign birth are as follows: Boston, 35.9 per cent; Chicago, 35.7 per cent; New York, 40.4 per cent; San Francisco, 31.4 per cent. The most menacing feature of this large percentage of foreign born in our cities is their tendency toward colonization. Thus they continue foreign habits of domestic life and thought.

"Another apparent evil is that of illiteracy. Ex-President Wilson said, 'Illiteracy is no fair test of qualification for citizenship. It may simply indicate a lack of opportunity.' Nevertheless it had its telling effect in past immigration. In 1882 when immigrants were coming from northern Europe, the percentage of illiteracy was very low, and a large per cent of professional and skilled labor came. With this literary intelligence, there was a knowledge of and a disposition to use and harness the forces of nature in the more rural sections, rather than snipe a living by cultivated city shrewdness. With the change in the tide of immigration for the few years preceding 1910, when eighty-five per cent of our immigrants came from eastern and southern Europe, illiteracy reached 26.6 per cent. Between 1908 and 1917, 1,617,000 illiterates over fourteen years of age had been admitted. Many of these, seeing the desirability of education strove earnestly for it, but at best their efforts lacked much of the cultural and developmental qualities. It enabled them to read the newspapers and follow the cheap politician rather than contribute toward the whole-some qualities of citizenship."

"An additional menace to the morals of society of these children of foreign born is their segregation in the parochial school of the Roman Catholic Church. We dare not assume

that the moral purposes of these schools is less honorable and idealistic. But the very fact that these children are daily in their own association without even the leaven of other American youth, augurs badly for our future. Their education and training has the tendency of leaving the impress of loyalty to religion as an institution rather than personal and inherent righteousness.

"But this class of first generation of immigrants now has a voice and a vote. Their voice, because of their colonization, is forceful. The politicians are eager to recognize it. The traditional and colonial ideals of our land are on the defence. To these it is not the promotion of better manhood, nor the perpetuity of the institutions of our land; it is personal gain and personal pleasure. A large number of these young men are and have been entering the professions. Law, medicine and business as a profession, are crowded with descendants of Russians and Italians. Their interpretation of the ethics and ideals of these professions is different. With the fiscal year of immigration closing June 30, 1930, 893 clergymen immigrants came over. We may well imagine that it would be difficult for them to see and interpret religion from our traditional point of view."

BOOKS

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH: CHAPTERS I-XXXIX ¹

DURING THE PAST few years the interest in the results of archeology has been growing at a rapid rate. The time is not far off when a comprehensive evaluation of these results with reference to the light they throw on the Scriptures will be in order. The present volume by Boutflower, the author of *In and Around the Book of Daniel*, is a beginning. The increasing knowledge of the age of Isaiah invites such a work as this, for the eighth century B.C. is now one of the best known periods of antiquity.

This book deals with the first thirty-nine chapters of Isaiah in the light of what has been found in the records of the Assyrians and Babylonians. No attempt is made to include the latter part of the prophecies of Isaiah in the discussion. The author says nothing in regard to the unity of the sixty-six chapters, although from hints given in the book the inference might be drawn that he is one of the few who would regard that unity as defensible. Be that as it may, the purpose here is to set forth the historic background of the earlier prophecies, and to construct a connected account of the work of the great prophet.

The order followed is broadly chronological. In the first chapter a review of the times is given briefly, but nothing material is added to the admirable treatment of this subject by G. A. Smith in his commentary. Following this there are a number of chapters dealing with the times of Ahaz. The troublous years before 705 B.C. are next described; to these years many of the oracles concerning foreign nations are

¹ *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters I-XXXIX. In the Light of the Assyrian Monuments.* By Charles Boutflower, M.A., late Vicar of Terling, Essex, and author of *In and Around the Book of Daniel*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1930. New York and Toronto: The Macmillan Company. Pp. xxiv + 364. Maps. Illustrations. Tables. Index.

attributed. Finally, a large portion of the work is devoted to a detailed study of the invasion under Sennacherib and the deliverance of Jerusalem, the events which furnished the climax in the life of the prophet. Two concluding chapters are given to the section known as Isaiah's "Little Apocalypse." A fairly representative list of authorities is included. The volume lacks an index of the Scripture passages cited and alluded to, though such an addition would make it more useful to the average reader.

The first subject that interests us is the chronology. The difficulties of this matter of dates are well known to all students of Isaiah. Mr. Boutflower solves the problem by fixing the date of the accession of Hezekiah. He accepts the suggestion that the writer of 2 Kings knew the date of the fall of Samaria, 722, and the date of the fall of Jerusalem, 587, together with the lengths of the reigns of the kings of Judah. "What he did not know was the date of Hezekiah's accession" (p. viii). In making the computation of the date of Hezekiah, therefore, the allowance for the overlapping of the years between the successive rulers was not made. If proper allowance for this is made, the result is 721 B.C. for the beginning of Hezekiah's reign.

With this as a basis, the other important dates in the life of Isaiah are fixed. "The year that king Uzziah died" is set at 736, instead of 740 as most commonly given. This reduces the reign of Jotham to one year. Ahaz became king in 735, and made his first appeal to the Assyrian for help that same year. The visit of the messengers from Babylon recorded in Isaiah 39 falls, on this reckoning, in 707. Hezekiah's death occurred in 692. The Assyrian chronology then fits into this general scheme. For the details of the harmonization the contents of the book must be referred to. In the Introduction the tables are given with the appropriate references in 2 Kings and Isaiah.

A second matter of considerable interest is the prophecy concerned with Immanuel. In his fourth and fifth chapters the author furnishes an explanation of the situation presented

in Isaiah 7 and 8, and especially of the prediction concerning the virgin in 7:14. It must be admitted that the light from the Assyrian monuments, which it is his purpose to give, is not very helpful at this point; most of the discussion consists of an exposition of the passage. The truth of the matter is that no historical evidence has come to us which will put the meaning of the Immanuel prophecy beyond doubt. Mr. Boutflower concludes for himself that the virgin of 7:14 was the second wife of the prophet, and that Immanuel was the second son, born, as the first and third sons of Isaiah, to be a sign to the King and the nation. The significance of the name lies in this, that when Ahaz heard it he was given to understand that God was with the prophet and his followers, and not with the King and his party. "He is with us, and therefore he is not with you" (p. 42). The support for this contention is to be found, as said before, in the statements of the passage itself, and not in the records of the past. One thing may be cited in its favor, *i.e.*, the fulfilment of the prophecy that before the child should know "to refuse the evil and choose the good" the two kingdoms to the north would be destroyed. This came to pass as predicted. In 733-732 both Israel and Damascus were conquered and many of their inhabitants carried away.

A yet more interesting deduction is made by the author, however:

"Within a year or two of Immanuel's birth Isaiah must have left Jerusalem for a while and gone to live in the now desolated land of Israel. For it is predicted of Immanuel that when he is a young lad two principal articles of his diet will be butter and honey: chap. vii. 15. And then, a little further on in the same chapter, it is explained that this being obliged to depend on butter and honey will be a consequence of the Assyrian invasion. . . . Now since this description of Immanuel's surroundings in his early boyhood's years does not apply to Judah and Jerusalem, but does apply to the land of Israel, and especially to northern Israel, the presumption is that Immanuel while still a young lad was taken by his father to live in the northern kingdom, and into that part of the kingdom whose inhabitants had so lately been carried captive." (P. 50 f.)

The reason for this flight from the homeland was of course the wrath of the King, and the place of seclusion was chosen because it was farthest from Jerusalem. Here in the desolate regions of the northern kingdom the heart of the prophet was touched by the fate of his brethren, and he uttered the prophecy concerning Zebulun and Naphtali. And in view of his retreat he committed his work to writing and entrusted it to the disciples who were left behind in the capital (8:11-20). "These instructions have about them the appearance of parting words of advice given by the teacher to his 'disciples'" (p. 54).

The dominant figure in the earlier part of Isaiah's life was the Assyrian king, Tiglathpileser, whose reign covered the period from 745 to 727. The records of this ruler are found to throw a great deal of light on the words of the prophet. Isaiah 14:4-23 is the basis for what is said about his influence in the affairs of Judah and its neighbors. The warrant for the identification of Tiglathpileser with the one portrayed in Isaiah 14 is based on a study of the records of the King's exploits. He is shown to have been a monarch who filled the earth with a sense of his power. He appears to have been an able organizer of empire. His attention to taxation and finance indicate a wise administration. As for his military accomplishments, they need no comment. According to the monuments he was the first Assyrian king ever to join the thrones of Assyria and Babylon.

This awe-inspiring prince was the first to take captive the people of God. To him is to be traced the policy of not letting "loose the captives to their home" (Isa. 14:17). Boutflower believes that in all respects such a man is calculated to fill the requirements of the picture drawn in the Burden of Babylon. Even the prediction of a return from captivity made in the first two verses of this fourteenth chapter is to be regarded as a promise that there will be deliverance for those who have been the victims of these first invasions of the Assyrian power. "The general inference from all these findings is that the prophecy belongs to the Isaianic age, and that there is no good reason

for impugning the title prefixed to it: **THE BURDEN OF BABYLON WHICH ISAIAH THE SON OF AMOZ DID SEE**" (p. 92).

As Tiglathpileser dominated the scene at the beginning of Isaiah's career, so Sennacherib dominated it at the end. And as under the former the troubles of the people of God began, so under the latter there took place the great deliverance which was the climax of the prophet's work. A large section of the book under review is devoted to the events of these closing years, and especially to the siege of Jerusalem.

The historical evidences which tend to confirm the Scripture record of this deliverance are the story which Herodotus claims to have found in Egypt; the history of Josephus; and certain of the Psalms, which reflect a great intervention of God for the salvation of His people. This last we regard as a very interesting suggestion. Specific mention is made by the author of Psalms 46, 48, and 76. It may well be that there are others which originated at this same time, for there can be no question that, according to the Scriptures, the defeat of the Assyrian was a spiritual experience of the most impressive kind.

But last of all among the historical records of the siege are the cuneiform inscriptions themselves, from which the author gleans certain facts that he regards as significant. The Taylor Cylinder is of course the subject of investigation at this point. Two things are mentioned as confirming Isaiah's account. One is the very familiar fact of the omission of any statement to the effect that Hezekiah had been defeated or his capital taken. In regard to this omission Boutflower quotes Martin, a French writer: "Sennakhérib n'avoue pas qu'il a subi un échec devant Jerusalem, mais son langage est plein de reticences" (p. 294). The other item is the opening statement of the record, "In my third campaign I marched to the Hittite land." (See p. 295.) Here it is to be supposed that Sennacherib deliberately omitted any reference to a campaign with Egypt as its objective because the objective was not attained, so that a general suggestion of an expedition to the west is offered instead. The author then, drawing somewhat

heavily on his imagination, supposes that the tribute sent by Hezekiah was brought by the Jewish messengers to Babylon and presented in the presence of the people of the city, so as to cover up the humiliation which the arms of the great King had sustained before Jerusalem. (See p. 295 f.)

Other details as to the subsequent career of Sennacherib are inferred from the same cylinder. Confirmation of the Biblical account of his death is discovered, and indications as to the fate of the assassins as well.

Using the historical facts gathered from the ancient records the author offers an interesting suggestion as to the much disputed section of Isaiah, chapters 24-27.

"I suggest, then, that we have in these chapters the prophetic dreamings of the prophet Isaiah in his old age, and this explains certain points of contact between these apocalypses and the scenes and events of his past life. . . . It is the fashion to speak of these chapters as 'reproductive prophecy,' composed—or shall I say compiled?—by writers 'saturated with the writings of Isaiah.' It is a simpler explanation to regard the writer as an aged man, reproducing in a manner suited to old age what he has already produced in the long ago past, saturated with the thoughts which have so long been in his mind, and bringing all to bear on the great and wide future revealed to him by the inspiring Spirit." (P. 328.)

So then, we find in these four chapters echoes of the same events with which we have been dealing in the earlier years of the prophet's ministry. Yet here the vision is extended far down the future, even to the days when the last enemy of man shall be overthrown.

As to the book as a whole, it may be said that it is something of a relief to find anyone who has a high regard for the inspiration and historical accuracy of Isaiah. Practically all the first thirty-nine chapters are attributed to the prophet himself, and are found to be true to the age in which he lived. It is assuredly a sound historical method which proceeds on the basis that a record is to be trusted unless it can be proved false, and that an explanation which substantiates a document

is to be welcomed if it can be found. The harmonization of the Assyrian inscriptions, the messages of Isaiah, and the record in 2 Kings, carried out in this book, is an effort in the right direction. For ourselves, we do not always agree with the construction here made; but in the main it is a useful work. At times the author has drawn too much on his imagination. There is a feeling, too, that full justice to the depth and comprehensiveness of Isaiah's insight has not been done; the vision of the prophet is almost too much limited to the horizon of his own age. Yet we may well be grateful for anyone who helps us to recover our appreciation of one of God's greatest spokesmen.

PAUL F. BARACKMAN.

THE REFORM MOVEMENT IN JUDAISM ²

WHILE THIS BOOK is not altogether easy reading, it is of great historical value and of vital interest to theologians. The author recognizes at the very start two conflicting traits in Jewish mentalities, an uncompromising conservatism and a kindly receptivity to the influences of a new environment. The rabbis exhibit the first most plainly, young men the second. Long services in Hebrew on Saturdays repelled the latter, disorders crept in, and many left the faith. They would no longer accept the doctrine that every law in the *Shulchan Aruk*, the oral and written laws codified, was binding.

By the close of the eighteenth century the ferment had begun to produce results. Education in secular branches, not merely in the Hebrew Bible and the Talmud, had become available, and it added to the unrest. The people began to demand something more of the rabbis—sermons in the vernacular and prayers that could be understood. In Berlin in particular the unrest grew stronger. The movement was entirely among the laymen, but the rabbis were soon compelled to take notice of their activities. Some were sympathetic, others bitterly

² *The Reform Movement in Judaism*. By David Philipson, D.D., Author of "The Jew in English Fiction," "Old European Jewries," etc., etc. New and revised edition. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1931. Pp. viii + 503. Notes. Index.

opposed. In 1818 the Hamburg temple was dedicated, and a reformed service was instituted. It produced a storm. The Talmud was in danger!

Thoroughly aroused at last, the rabbis began to bestir themselves; the fight was on. For a time it centered in two rabbis, Abraham Geiger and S. A. Tiktin, and the former became prominent as an advocate of reform. Finding that polemics were not enough, a rabbinical conference was called in 1884, a second followed in 1845, and a third in 1846. The first opened bravely, but did little more than draw the fire of those opposed to progress; the second seemed more promising, but settled nothing; the third slumped. The Sabbath service was the crux; they did not have the courage to advise its transfer to Sunday.

While this contest was raging another was going on over a new prayer book issued by the Hamburg temple. Government interference was sought by the conservatives with some success. In the end the temple was allowed to go on in peace, although the opposition was fierce and determined.

In England as well as in Germany the heaven was at work. The Talmud lost its place of authority. The contest was so bitter, however, that the chief rabbi refused "to permit the solemnization of a marriage between a member of the orthodox community and a girl whose father was affiliated with the reform congregation, and who herself had attended services there, unless the latter would promise to live in accordance with orthodox practice and never set foot in the reform synagogue" (p. 105).

In Frankfort-on-the-Main a Society of the Friends of Reform was organized by laymen, and the way was opened for the use of German in Sabbath services in the synagogue by devotional exercises held in the Philanthropin, a school presided over by Dr. M. Hess. They began in 1813, but became so popular under a new teacher, Dr. M. Creizenach, that a chapel had to be erected in 1828 to accommodate the adults who wished to attend. Confirmation services for boys and girls were instituted, and the reform movement grew in strength.

Rabbis were excluded from the society, which formulated five principles: (1) That the Mosaic religion is capable of continuous development; (2) that the ancient ritual, dietary, and similar laws are not binding; (3) that circumcision is not binding "either as a religious act or a symbol"; (4) that the Talmud is not "authoritative"; and (5) that they do not expect or long for a Messiah to lead Jews back to Palestine. (P. 118.)

The rabbinical conferences had to face these principles; the conservatives fought them with intensity; but Samuel Adler put the matter thus:

"What right have we to reform! the traditional right to modify the biblical ceremonial according to temporal and local conditions. The question was asked often whence we obtained that right. From the people. The free will of the people recognized the Talmudists, the free will of the people will recognize us also. We too are Talmudists. Hence we can insist on this same right." (P. 147.)

Other burning questions kept coming up, particularly the time for a weekly service. Rabbinical casuistry had modified its observance, and some sought to follow the same path. It was unfortunate. Some gains were made. It was decided that a Jew could marry a Christian if the state laws allowed the children to be brought up as Jews. The status of women was improved. It was recognized that modern life made a proper observance of the Sabbath (Saturday) impossible. Also that a strict observance of the Mosaic legislation meant a return of sacrifice. Nevertheless it was decided that this part of the Torah should still be read, if it was read in Hebrew! (P. 181.) One struggle concerned the use of an organ in the synagogue. The organ finally came out ahead.

Reform in Berlin was blocked by the government. Three classes of Jews were represented there: The "orthodox," who observed the code; the "hypocrites," who demanded the code, but did not observe it; and the "indifferentists," who were Jews only in name. (P. 226.) Casuistry was prevalent. One Jewish writer, "(whose standpoint was just this of orthodoxy

in practice and the greatest heterodoxy in theory) claims that Judaism is practice and not dogma; that a rabbi can entertain the freest opinions privately, but cannot carry these out in practice. . . . he is the representative of the congregation." (Note on p. 477.)

A *Cultur Verein*, formed in 1840, finally opened the way. A lecture course was the starting point. An appeal was sent out to other Jews. It called for faith, positive religion, and Judaism. (P. 227 ff.) It ended with a call for a synod. Its spirit was admirable, and an Association for Reform in Judaism resulted. Of necessity it was strictly a lay movement. An appeal to the rabbinical conference failed of its purpose, and a second appeal was ignored. Having become strong by this time they decided to use a temporary form of worship, employing the vernacular almost entirely.

They worshiped with uncovered heads, ceased to blow the ram's horn on New Year's Day, used female voices in the choir, seated men and women on the same floor on different sides of the house, and had the preacher and the choir pronounce the benediction instead of the *Aaronides*. These were radical and far-reaching changes. Eventually they held their services on Sunday only.

In 1850 their petition for an "autonomous congregation" to be called the Jewish Reform Congregation was rejected by the government on the ground that they had no creed. They decided to pay no more dues to the chief congregation, but were forced to do so by legal process. The movement was thus checked. The fundamentals of Judaism were declared to be monotheism, the mission of Israel, and faith in the coming days of universal peace. (P. 259.)

In Breslau the Friends of Reform were pushing things, and similar results were produced. One feature of the bitter opposition was a barrage of anonymous pamphlets. The movement was effectively checked as a result.

Reform in Hungary was some fifty years longer in getting started, but it resembled that in Germany. The rabbis were

even more bitter, however, and insisted that the Jews were to return to Palestine. The political upheaval in 1848 aroused the Jews to action, and a reform society was organized in Pesth on the Berlin lines, though more radical. They threw away almost everything but the Ten Commandments. The government ultimately suppressed them.

In 1869 a synod was finally convened at Leipzig. There were eighty-three delegates from sixty congregations, forty-nine being laymen. Religious Education, the Liturgy, the Sabbath Morning Service, the Three High Feasts, the Morning Service of *Rosh Hashanah*, *Yom Kippur*, General Matters, and Circumcision were considered. It was mildly for reform. Two years later another was held; it was smaller and accomplished little. Both were really failures.

The reform movement culminated in the United States. It began in a small way in Charleston, South Carolina, in 1824, but German immigrants were really responsible for its ultimate success. Young laymen were the driving element behind the progressive rabbis, but great leaders were developed and remarkable progress was made. As usual there were rabbinical conferences, new prayer books appeared, revisions were made, the question of proselytes was considered, that of the Sabbath was discussed to such purpose that Sunday services were authorized, and a college was founded. As a result European Jews were stimulated to further efforts, and progress was made.

HERBERT W. MAGOUN.

KARL BARTH'S THEOLOGY³

KARL BARTH is the outstanding figure in German theological circles at the present time. Whatever we think of him and his followers, his influence both in his own land and in other

³ *The Teaching of Karl Barth*. By R. Birch Hoyle, A.T.S., author of *The Holy Spirit in St. Paul*; contributor to *The Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, etc. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1930. Pp. 286. Index.

The Karl Barth Theology: or The New Transcendentalism. By Alvin Sylvester Zerbe, Ph.D., D.D., Professor Emeritus, Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio. Cleveland: Central Publishing House. 1930. Pp. xviii + 279. Index.

countries is beyond dispute. The movement is quite modern, or it may be said to date from the publication of Barth's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in 1919. The author leaped into prominence immediately, and the movement thus inaugurated seems to partake of the intense energy of the founder. The literature of the school in German is considerable, but until quite recently nothing was available in English except Brunner's *Theology of Crisis* and Horton's translation of Barth's *The Word of God and the Word of Man*. The two books here under review, by R. Birch Hoyle and Professor Alvin Sylvester Zerbe, are a distinct contribution to the literature on the movement.

Two questions emerge in connection with Barth: First, what is his message; second, can we agree with it? In my review of present theological views in the January issue of THE BIBLICAL REVIEW I concluded with the remark that ere long an animated discussion would arise about the validity of Barth's reasoning. Dr. Zerbe's book is a fulfilment of the forecast. He sets out to prove, and with success, that Barth differs radically in more ways than one from the doctrinal positions of the Reformers. As he expresses it in his conclusion,

"Any attempt to compare Karl Barth with theologians of the post-Schleiermacher period, either in Europe or America, is futile. . . . Barth is in a class by himself. He is neither a fundamentalist, nor a modernist, and yet he is both. He regards no one doctrine, whether the *sola fide* of Luther, the *solī Deo gloria* of Calvin, or the love or holiness of God as pivotal, but Scripture as the Word of God (which, too, is a doctrine). This sounds well, but in the hands of Barth and his school, it means something entirely different from the generally accepted doctrine of a well-authenticated Bible. . . . Our investigation has shown that Barthianism strictly is not a defence or exposition of protestant doctrine as heretofore understood, but a cosmic philosophy in which the fundamental doctrines of God, man, sin, redemption, the Bible, time and eternity are in a new setting and have a meaning entirely different from the old creeds and confessions. It is a theological upheaval in which scarcely one stone remains in its original

place. This would not matter, if the cataclysm revealed the true order, but that is questionable." (P. 269 f.)

This summary represents accurately the reaction of an enquiring fundamentalism to the teachings of Barth and his school. The issue between them centers round the Bible. When it was known that the Barthians proclaimed the supreme authority of the Word of God and the Deity of Christ, Fundamentalists rejoiced, for they felt they had a powerful ally. But, as Zerbe points out in the course of his argument, their views on the Bible are radically divergent. There can be no question that the Reformers generally accepted a view of plenary inspiration, which guaranteed the accuracy of the inspired message. When Luther affirmed that the authorship of a book of the Bible mattered little, he did not mean what some modern critics have alleged, that the contents might be interpreted liberally, but that the warrant for its accuracy was in God Himself. With this view Fundamentalism is in accord, and that is why it has opposed the work of higher criticism. But the Barthian school allows full liberty to critical inquiry. This is pointed out in both the books under review. Hoyle quotes from Barth's writings this sentence: "'The Word of God appears even to-day in the Bible, and apart from this appearing it (the Bible) is not the word of God but one book as other books'" (p. 251). Again that "'historism must be allowed to say its say out with reason and right as to the Biblical text.'"

But, if Barth cannot find authority in the text of the Bible, where can he find it? The answer seems to be, in conscience. Now the evidence of conscience has always been accepted by the Reformers, but not as the supreme witness. Luther distinguished between the subjective witness of the Spirit to the soul and the objective witness in the Scriptures. In other words the Scriptures teach us the truth; we find that it is truth by experience. The Barthian view may be represented by a quotation from Brunner, made by Zerbe:

"'For orthodoxy the Bible is in itself the divine truth of revelation. For genuine Christian faith Scripture is revelation

only in connection with the actually present Spirit of God. The testimony of the Holy Spirit and the clarity of the Word of God are one and the same. Therefore the principle of Scripture is the paradoxical unity of autonomy and authority, of the given and not-given. Faith is a meeting with the absolutely hidden God, who as real, reveals himself to us personally.'” (P. 126.)

Zerbe criticizes this statement as containing truths and half-truths (p. 127). He quotes again:

“The words of Scripture as such are human words. . . . It rests upon false testimony but just therein is its truth above all truth. So the Bible as a whole. It is full of errors, contradictions, false conceptions of many human, natural, historical relations. It contains many contradictions in the account of the life of Jesus; it is overgrown with legends even in the New Testament. Many of the parts are written in helpless, common, inaccurate language; others again rise to the height of magnificent literary works. The one does not disturb, the other does not enhance the faith-authority of Scripture.’” (P. 127 f.)

To this Zerbe replies:

“If the Bible be full of errors and contradictions of every sort, how can it be the word of God? How can we reach truth? How can it be a revelation of Jesus Christ?” (P. 128.)

It must be obvious that the Barthians cannot ignore the theory of knowledge. If conscience is the ground of assurance, how is its authority to be vindicated? Zerbe feels that they must fall back on some form of transcendentalism—“The only question is: What kind of transcendentalism?” (P. 203.) There is the New England transcendentalism of Emerson and others, based on that of Schelling. But this is an abomination to the Barthians, for it is the philosophy of Schleiermacher. If we are to attach Barth to any philosophic school at all, it must be to that of Kant. Yet there is a difference between them. “Kant predicated a moral consciousness as guaranteeing God, freedom and immortality; Barth postulates a transcendent God and a transcendental faith as a basis of religion and revelation” (p. 207). This is a discussion of too abstract a

nature to be entered on in a review. Yet we venture to wonder whether any satisfactory result will be achieved by attempting to interpret Barth philosophically.

It seems to us that we shall catch his meaning more nearly by leaving philosophic transcendentalism alone and approaching the problem along such a line as that of Wesley's doctrine of the witness of the Spirit. Wesley accepted the Scriptures without any critical reservations, but to him the essential thing was the new life in Christ, realized by faith. The validity of this was attested by the Spirit. Brunner has already been quoted as saying, "The testimony of the Holy Spirit and the clarity of the Word of God are one and the same." This obviously means that the Holy Spirit directs and informs the conscience, revealing the divine truth. Thus it has a selective reference, and that is why the thought of mistakes in the Bible does not worry Brunner. Barth's doctrine of conscience therefore seems to include a categorical affirmation of the enlightening witness of the Spirit.

One of the great advantages of the Barthian dialectic is that it stimulates discussion; but the issues raised are so many and varied that it is impossible even to touch upon them in a review. We therefore content ourselves with heartily recommending to our readers both these books.

One of the great merits of Zerbe's book is the exposition he gives of the dialectical method employed by Barth and of the German philosophical thought to which Barth's work is related, if only by way of opposition. Hoyle has the distinctive merit that he gives a splendid bird's eye view of the Barthian position. Zerbe as a Fundamentalist joins issue with Barth, and seeks to lay bare the true Barthian position. In that position there is much that evokes discussion and much that is praiseworthy. Hoyle thinks more of the latter than of the former; so he writes:

"We had intended another chapter, in which an attempt would have been made to assess the value of this new mode of dealing with the problems of the day, and the worth of the men engaged in this labour. On second thoughts we refrain. They

are lost in their work for God, and it would infringe their principle to award to men the 'glory which is due to God alone.' *Laus Deo.*" (P. 277 f.)

This attitude will commend itself strongly to many; others will think with Zerbe, that the issues must be clearly stated and battle joined. Both books show fine scholarship, and are valuable contributions to the literature on the subject.

ANDREW R. OSBORN.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY GOD? ⁴

THE TITLE of this book may suggest to some readers an ultra-modern attempt to reduce God to the realm of the impersonal. But the author's interest is in establishing the personality of God. He uses this title as a bait for the ultra-Modernists in the hope that they may by it be led to read its pages. It carries his challenge to meet them upon the common ground of the question: "What do we mean by God?" and from that starting point, without doing any violence to science or philosophy, he will force any honest, logical, intellectually informed modern to acknowledge that "personality" is the true historical characteristic of God, and an essential quality in reality. This is a very large undertaking, but the author feels perfectly confident that he is able to make good. And he does so in a remarkable manner.

In a day, when so many modern, intellectually alert religious thinkers have been endeavoring to "sell" religion to this age by reducing its claims to those that can be established by the "scientific method," and when it is thought that science is the only hope of religion, it is refreshing to find a scholar of Dr. Valentine's sympathetic attitude toward science and philosophy insisting that religion is something more than science and philosophy. And that after science and philosophy have contributed all they have to give to religion, still there remains

⁴ *What Do We Mean by God? Some Studies in the Objectivity of Christian Experience.* By Cyril H. Valentine, Ph.D. (Lond.). New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 248. Index.

for religion the unique quality of the experience which makes it religion.

It is doubtful whether this book could have been written in America. Hardly any American scholar thoroughly familiar with the modern scientific and philosophical positions of the day would have been able to use the word *personality* so confidently. Our university intellectualism would put us too completely on the defensive before we started, so that we would feel rather hopeless about getting anywhere with that word central. Dr. Valentine lives in an intellectual atmosphere where *personality* still has respectable standing, and so he proceeds with his study without the inhibitions which would hinder the American scholar. And this gives him a wonderful start.

He recognizes that the danger which confronts religion today comes from psychology and is in the realm of the subjective. But he is not alarmed by the fact that all religious knowledge is now pronounced as a product of the mind of man. He calls our attention to the fact that general knowledge at one stage of its career was subjected to the same realm. Socrates bridged the chasm between the subjective and objective by adding to sense perception reason. Man the sentient creature is also rational, and man's reason rather than his sense perception is his higher quality. A similar escape is urged for religious knowledge today. But reason cannot lead us to the God of religion; the rational does not bring us to the object of faith and worship. It is very important to remember that the author does not propose to ignore science or philosophy, but to advance from their positions to that of religious knowledge.

Dr. Valentine is a thoroughgoing rationalist; he does not attempt to seek the foundation of religious knowledge in the irrational or the nonrational. He moves from sense perception, through reason, to religious knowledge. This is one of the unique features of his work. Because of his fear of the non-rational, he criticizes Professor Rudolph Otto's position in *The Idea of the Holy*. He feels that Otto's analysis of reli-

religious experience which goes down to the nonrational is a dangerous error. We have given a great deal of study to this position of Otto's, and are convinced that Dr. Valentine entirely misunderstands Dr. Otto's position. They are in much more fundamental agreement than appears. Each needs the supplemental help of the other. Dr. Valentine selects the word "response" as the key word in his whole theory. And if he were forced to analyze the psychological elements in that idea on its human side, he would be forced to seek the help of Otto. As it is, he uses this word as explanatory of the essential religious nature of the object of religious experience. Response is a very popular psychological term. It is fundamental in the behavioristic psychology, in dynamic psychology, in *gestalt* psychology, and in reaction psychology. So it wins ready recognition from this field. Dr. Valentine is not a psychologist, but a philosopher; he is not interested in the response of the human being, but in the response of the object of religious experience. The religious person believes that the object of religious experience is capable of response. This is the stimulus idea that calls religious experience into functioning. This is what sets religion off in a field by itself. If the idea of God is the product of the human imagination, to philosophy this God is nonexistent and so is incapable of response. If the universe of science is accepted as the god of religion, then this god is incapable of response. Religion demands for its life something more than psychology and philosophy provide. But at the same time our author insists that an object which lacks the reality of the universe is equally unsatisfactory to the religious mind. He says:

"A God who falls short of the reality of the universe is no God for a rational faith. There is no sufficiency except in a God upon whom both man and the universe alike depend. God must be all in all." (P. 19.)

Most of our modern thinkers have not had the courage to demand enough of the transcendent in God. Our author

yields nothing at this point. He insists that God shall be God. So we read:

"If the idea of God can be accounted for as mere projection, and the doctrine of God explained as an example of rationalising, then the God so discovered is a God made by man in man's own image, and such a God is not an object suitable to meet the religious demands" (p. 23).

Psychology in its subjective explanation of the idea of God provides a god which falls short of the requirements necessary to sustain the religious experience. Humanists from the days of Greece have tried to make humanity a substitute for the God of religion, but it is never long before they find their hosannas languishing on their lips and their devotion dying. With Hocking our author says: "The object of religion must be capable of evoking worship." In like manner the universe of science and the absolute reality of philosophy are incapable of evoking the worship of religion's God. This brings us to the fundamental problem, which the author states in these words:

"What we need to discover is the least that we can mean by God when God is used as a religious term. What are those features which cannot be relinquished without surrendering God as the object of religion? It would seem that the minimum essentials for the God of religion are two." (P. 27.)

We will put these requirements by themselves in the next quotation:

"As against psychology we must claim for God the nature of ultimate reality: as against philosophy we must claim for God the nature of responsiveness. The problem of the objectivity of religious experience may therefore be stated thus: Can God have the nature of ultimate reality and at the same time be responsive to human needs?" (P. 27.)

This stating of the minimum requirements of a God for religion places the requirements very high. Neither psychology nor science nor art nor philosophy is capable of producing a

God to fulfill them. This means that these cannot substitute for religion. In a most interesting way our author shows that psychology, science in general, art, and philosophy have very important contributions to make to religious knowledge, and they often make a demand for revolutionary readjustments in the field of creed and ceremony which should be met. Religious knowledge is not apart from other knowledge; it is part and parcel of the same realm. At the same time he shows that a sound religious knowledge and experience have a profound contribution to make to psychology, science in general, art, and philosophy, as well as to ethics. Nowhere in modern times has this point been more effectively made.

The unique feature of religious truth is its belief that reality is responsive to human personality. Out of this faith religious experience is born. The seeking for this responsiveness in reality and the finding are the essence of religion. Human personality seeks and finds reality responsive to its nature. So reality partakes of personality. And the part of human nature that is real and eternal is personality.

At this point the whole rich field of theology and Christology bursts into view, and the reviewer wishes that he had an article in which to give the reader some idea of what is to be found. But it has taken a book to provide the author with space enough to work out his theory, and nothing less than the reading of this book will bring satisfaction to the reader. With the publication of this work the corner has been turned, and we are starting out on a new development in the field of the psychology and philosophy of religion. We will never return to the old scientific method of defending religious truth and religious experience. Nor will we ignore science or philosophy in our search. All departments of truth are interdependent, and cannot carry on alone. When general science, psychology, ethics, art, and philosophy learn this truth as religion is learning it progress will begin anew.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION ⁵

AMERICAN READERS have been waiting for a work of W. Schmidt, the eminent German ethnologist and anthropologist, in the English language. Scholars have previously been acquainted with his immense work *Ursprung der Gottesidee* which appeared in Germany in two volumes, with the third in press. H. J. Rose, Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrews, has made available for our wider reading a cross section of Schmidt's facts and theories in his translation of the present volume into English. Father Schmidt himself felt that his previous extensive work was too bulky to be used freely even as a reference text. So he gave himself to the task of presenting a briefer review which would include all that is essential for an understanding of the subject. The result is *The Origin and Growth of Religion: Facts and Theories*, based largely on his *The Origin of the Idea of God* (3 vols.), including, however, the introduction of wholly new sections and a totally new arrangement of the material.

Schmidt has worked out in more complete detail an idea which is merely suggested in his *Ursprung* (Vol. I, ed. 2, p. 795), namely, that the various schools of comparative religion and their respective theories follow one another in a succession just the reverse of that in which the religions themselves have appeared in the course of history (cf. p. 9 ff.). This volume, then, includes a history of the subject itself, an account of the various theories, movements, and schools, and a brief account of religions in the historical order of their appearance. Much of the controversial material which was necessary in the larger *Ursprung* has been omitted. This makes possible a much more sympathetic approach to the ideas of other ethnologists for students who would use this book as a reference text or handbook. There is a striking absence of any description of reli-

⁵*The Origin and Growth of Religion: Facts and Theories.* By W. Schmidt, Professor in the University of Vienna. Translated from the original German by H. J. Rose, Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrews. New York: Lincoln MacVeagh, The Dial Press. 1931. (Imprimatur of Cardinal Hayes.) Pp. xvi + 302. Indexes.

gious origins other than by means of purely natural knowledge and the methods of historical ethnology.

The one point on which Professor Schmidt has been most severely criticized, and to which criticism he continues to open himself in this volume, is his belief that monotheism is in the background of every savage religion. He thinks that originally all were monotheists and that since then men have degenerated into polytheism and have developed back again into monotheism in many places. The French school of ethnologists count Schmidt simply intolerable on this point. American scholars in the same field are apt to be more tolerant and admit that Schmidt has at least amassed a vast wealth of facts and that there appears to be an ever growing mass of evidence supporting his thesis. Some, however, believe that these facts made available by Schmidt's research may be used to disprove just as well as prove his point.

Now Dr. Schmidt is a professor in the University of Vienna and is a Roman Catholic priest. In fact the volume bears the imprimatur of Patrick Cardinal Hayes of New York and bears the *Nihil obstat* of the Censor Librorum of the Catholic Church. To be true to his faith and to be certain of the approval of the Pope, Schmidt can say nothing beyond what he contends for. In every way his theory coincides with the theories and implications in the Holy Scriptures. In his defense one must say that there are some other prominent scholars in the field who also maintain that monotheism is the background of all primitive religion.

After a historical introduction in the first three chapters of the book, Father Schmidt opens Part II with a discussion of Nature Myths, Fetishism, Manism, and Animism. The third part of the book deals with Star-Myths, Totemism, Magism, and Dynamism. Part IV deals entirely with The Supreme Sky God in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The last part is concerned with The Content of the Primitive Belief in High Gods.

Whether one agrees entirely with Father Schmidt is of

little moment in finally evaluating this volume. For students of comparative religion, anthropology, and ethnology his work is an invaluable source. Many new facts resulting from the author's careful research in a rich field might be used in support of any theory, but the sources themselves are indispensable. There is an Index of subjects and an Index of authors which make the author's source material readily available.

R. W. ALBRIGHT.

THE HISTORY OF FUNDAMENTALISM⁶

PROFESSOR COLE'S *History of Fundamentalism* has given us a much needed source of information and a study which is indispensable for a proper understanding of American Christianity. The author divides his book into four sections, showing, first, the background of the current Christian conflict with the rise of liberalism; second, the current conflict within the church, with a special study of the Baptists, Presbyterians, Disciples, Methodists, and Anglicans; third, the current conflict beyond the church, with the rise of numerous nondenominational agencies for the "preservation of the faith"; and, fourth, a critical conclusion to the whole discussion, with a careful psychological analysis of the causes of the attitudes of individuals and organizations. There is a seven-page Index and a nine-page Bibliography. In his gathering of sources Dr. Cole has pretty well exhausted the field, and in addition has preserved here many invaluable sources which were distributed widely, yet not preserved because they appeared in pamphlet form. This is a fitting place to pay tribute to the painstaking research of the author who might have omitted much of the less common material and still substantiated his point of view. Dr. Cole has blazed a new trail, and a wide one, in this work in virgin territory, and we feel that his volume will be a valuable handbook for the student of American Christianity.

⁶ *The History of Fundamentalism*. By Stewart G. Cole, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. 1931. Pp. xiv + 360. Bibliography. Index.

The author believes that the conflict between leaders in fundamental and liberal Christianity was caused by the contact of religion with modern science in such views as found in the works of Darwin and Professor Agassiz's speech at Harvard in 1873, when he said: "Gentlemen, the world is older than we have been taught to think. Its age is as if one were gently to rub a silk handkerchief across Plymouth Rock once a year until it was reduced to a pebble." (P. 21.)

He shows that one group of religionists looked to pre-scientific theology for its content of Christianity and defended that, in order to "carry forward a genuine piety." Their appeal was to Biblical literalism. The other group sought truth as they would any other form of knowledge and trusted the method of experimental religion. Later the author speaks of these points of view, which have been in conflict during years of disturbances, as the priestly and the prophetic functions of religion respectively. If we may anticipate a later interpretation, it is a fair judgment that it will come through the recognition that it is not the overemphasis of either function, but the proper relation of both, which vitalizes religion.

"Christianity will reassert its power in the humanly-distraught world as men nurture the fine sense of religious loyalty that inspired conservatives, as men pioneer with strong heart the unbeaten highways of truth which liberals seek, and as they wed this fervor and discipline into the harmony of Christian leadership" (p. 337).

It was the impact of secular culture upon Christian thinkers in general and the advent of the scientific method of research in the colleges and seminaries of the church specifically which brought the newer, or liberal, interpretation of Christianity. It was not long until from these centers of learning teachers and ministers disseminated this point of view widely. This sent those who had been until this time simply conservative Christians into a position which the author calls Fundamentalism. The newly found cultural and scientific approach to Christianity impelled much enthusiasm among its adherents and compelled the Conservatives to launch a defensive campaign.

Though the author does not say so in so many words, one may infer that an aggressive militant spirit in progressive, or liberal, Christianity has led to what is called Modernism, while the same type of an aggressive militant spirit among Conservative Christians has led to Fundamentalism.

"As long as traditional Christianity was universally in vogue in America, evangelicals were 'one body in Christ'. When scholars began to cultivate the historical approach to the Scriptures, courageous churchmen welcomed the findings and advanced a more fitting program for the kingdom of God. . . . Conservative men took stock to discover that their testimony and personalities were being neglected in on-going Christianity. Consequently, they felt themselves slighted in God's work in the world." (P. 334.)

"The debatable beliefs, which fundamentalists found necessary to reinforce sentimentally in the face of modernists' criticism, grew resistant to doubt and (to use F. O. S. Schiller's words) were toughened by the shock of dissent. The faith of modernism did not so much damage the dogmas of the orthodox; rather it invigorated them." (P. 331.)

These disturbed Conservatives were free to do one of two things. Either they could reevaluate their religious heritage in terms of new cultural ideals and thus at least fraternize with those of more progressive views, or they could "reinforce their inherited faith with dogmatic loyalty and attack the validity of their fellow-Christians' experience." Dr. Cole contends that they did the latter. "Conservatives *became* fundamentalists." (P. 334.)

Analyzing the Fundamentalist position psychologically, the author believes that there were three drives compelling these individuals on: First, the desire for an unshakable religious security; second, the desire for a like-minded Christian fellowship; and, third, the desire for the administrative direction of the church of Christ.

The largest section of the book is devoted to the account of just what happened in the respective denominations when these Progressives and Conservatives clashed. Limited by the title itself this work can show only the influence of the afore-

mentioned drives that sent the Conservatives into various kinds of organization, into publicity, even into court trials, to assure themselves security, likeminded fellowship, and administrative control of the church.

We would suggest that a companion volume to this one would be a history of Modernism, in which the other side of the story, only touched briefly in this book, could be told. Even in the accounts of the organized Conservative movement in the few denominations selected Dr. Cole was severely limited and compelled to choose only the most significant items from his wealth of source materials. We believe that it was because of this fact that many of the smaller denominations are not included in the study.

R. W. ALBRIGHT.

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

INDEX OF VOL. XVI, 1931

- Albright, R. W. *The Origin and Growth of Religion*.—W. Schmidt. (Book review.)
The History of Fundamentalism.—Stewart G. Cole. (Book review.)....
 American Christianity, Permanent Deposits of Colonialism in. Abdel Ross Wentz
 Atheism, The Mood of. P. Whitwell Wilson.....
Authorized Bible Vindicated, Our.—Benjamin G. Wilkinson. (Book review.) Herbert W. Magoun.....
 Barackman, Paul F. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters I-XXXIX*.—Charles Boutflower. (Book review.).....
Barth, The Teaching of Karl.—R. Birch Hoyle. (Book review under title, Karl Barth's Theology.) Andrew R. Osborn.....
Barth Theology, The Karl.—Alvin Sylvester Zerbe. (Book review under title, Karl Barth's Theology.).....
 Barth's Theology, Karl. (Book reviews of *The Teaching of Karl Barth*.—R. Birch Hoyle. *The Karl Barth Theology*.—Alvin Sylvester Zerbe.) Andrew R. Osborn.....
 Biblical Supernatural, A Study of the. Harold Paul Sloan.....
 Birch, T. Bruce. *The Life, Teaching, and Influence of William of Ockham*... Books. (Reviewed under *The Review*.).....134, 291, 457,
 Chown, S. D. *A Search for Reality in Religion*.....
 Christian Symbolics. (Book reviews of: *Christian Symbolics*.—E. H. Klotsche. *Religions and Philosophies in the United States of America*.—Compiled by Julius A. Weber.).....
Christian Symbolics.—E. H. Klotsche. (Book review under title, Christian Symbolics.) Robert M. Kurtz.....
 Colonialism in American Christianity, Permanent Deposits of. Abdel Ross Wentz
 Country Minister, The Problems of a. John C. Siler.....
Crisis in Religion, The Present.—W. E. Orchard. (Book review.) James Palmer
 Cummings, Thomas F. *Mahatma Gandhi—His Own Story*.—Edited by C. F. Andrews. (Book review.).....
Hinduism Invades America.—Wendell Thomas. (Book review.).....
 Current Tendencies which Limit Faith and Life. Alva J. McClain.....
 Current Thought and Activity. (Under *The Review*.) Robert M. Kurtz... 261, 427, 58
 Dan Crawford.—G. E. Tilsley. (Book review.) Charles R. Erdman.....
 Dana, H. E. *Jesus' Use of the Old Testament*.....
 Dawson, W. Bell. *Science and Divine Revelation*.....
De Sacramento Altaris of William of Ockham, The.—Edited by T. Bruce Birch. (Book review.) Andrew R. Osborn.....
Decline of the Medieval Church, The.—Alexander Clarence Flick. (Book review.) Paul C. Warren.....
 Divine Revelation, Science and. W. Bell Dawson.....

	PAGE
ine Wrath and Human History. Andrew R. Osborn. (Under Exegetical.)	97
o We Really Try to Understand? Herbert W. Magoun.....	61
anfall of the Mechanistic Dynasty, The. Part II. Albert Clarke Wyckoff.	331
Bose, H. M. Humanism—New and Old.....	492
rtorial. Robert M. Kurtz.....	5, 165, 325, 485
lman, Charles R. <i>Dan Crawford</i> .—G. E. Tilsley. (Book review.).....	144
geetical:	
Divine Wrath and Human History. Andrew R. Osborn.....	97
The Labors of the Christian Ministry. Howard T. Kuist.....	245
Second Corinthians 3:12-4:6. Andrew R. Osborn.....	250
Isaiah 40:27-31. Andrew R. Osborn.....	411
Some Arduous Elements of Christian Experience. Howard Tillman Kuist.	415
The Responsibility of Privilege. Andrew R. Osborn.....	574
Hebrews 4:11-13. Howard T. Kuist.....	579
ith and Life, Current Tendencies which Limit. Alva J. McClain.....	34
ursquare.—John Rathbone Oliver. (Book review.) Albert Clarke Wyckoff.	148
ontispiece:	
Harold Paul Sloan.....	4
P. Whitwell Wilson.....	164
H. E. Dana.....	324
H. M. Du Bose.....	484
undamentalism, <i>The History of</i> .—Stewart G. Cole. (Book review.) R. W.	
Albright	632
andhi— <i>His Own Story, Mahatma</i> .—Edited by C. F. Andrews. (Book	
review.) Thomas F. Cummings.....	317
erman Rationalism at Its First Appearance. J. L. Neve.....	190
od, <i>What Do We Mean by?</i> —Cyril H. Valentine. (Book review.) Albert	
Clarke Wyckoff.....	625
reek New Testament, New Ideas and Methods of Study in the. A. T. Robert-	
son	49
reenfield, John. James Montgomery, Moravian Hymn Writer.....	344
ebrews 4:11-13. Howard T. Kuist. (Under Exegetical.).....	579
induism Invades America.—Wendell Thomas. (Book review.) Thomas F.	
Cummings	466
oly Kabbalah, <i>The</i> .—A. E. Waite. (Book review.) Agide Pirazzini.....	151
oyle, R. Birch. The Paraclete in Tertullian's Writings.....	170
umanism—New and Old. H. M. Du Bose.....	492
atah: <i>Chapters I-XXXIX, The Book of</i> .—Charles Boutflower. (Book re-	
view.) Paul F. Barackman.....	610
ames Montgomery, Moravian Hymn Writer. John Greenfield.....	344
usus' Use of the Old Testament. H. E. Dana.....	389
uist, Howard Tillman:	
The Labors of the Christian Ministry. (Under Exegetical.).....	245
Some Arduous Elements of Christian Experience. (Under Exegetical.)..	415
Hebrews 4:11-13. (Under Exegetical.).....	579

Kurtz, Robert M. Editorial.....	5, 165, 325,	PA 4
Current Thought and Activity.....	108, 261, 427,	5
<i>Word Pictures in the New Testament</i> .—Archibald Thomas Robertson. (Book review.).....		1
Christian Symbolics. (Book reviews of <i>Christian Symbolics</i> .—E. H. Klotsche. <i>Religions and Philosophies in the United States of America</i> . —Compiled by Julius A. Weber.).....		4
Labors of the Christian Ministry, The.—Howard T. Kuist. (Under Exegetical.)		2
Laodiceans, The Letter to the. W. J. McKnight.....		5
Letter to the Laodiceans, The. W. J. McKnight.....		5
Lewis, Frederick W. <i>D. L. Moody</i> .—William R. Moody. (Book review.)....		3
Life, Current Tendencies which Limit Faith and. Alva J. McClain.....		3
Life, Teaching, and Influence of William of Ockham, The. T. Bruce Birch....		3
Magoun, Herbert W.:		
Do We Really Try to Understand?.....		3
<i>The Prophetic Prospects of the Jews</i> .—Patrick Fairbairn. (Book review.)		3
<i>Our Authorized Bible Vindicated</i> .—Benjamin G. Wilkinson. (Book re- view.)		4
<i>The Reform Movement in Judaism</i> .—David Philipson. (Book review.)...		6
McClain, Alva J. Current Tendencies which Limit Faith and Life.....		3
McKee, Dean G. <i>The Supreme Book of Mankind</i> .—James G. K. McClure. (Book review.).....		1
McKnight, W. J. The Letter to the Laodiceans.....		5
<i>Meaning of the Cross, The</i> .—Henry Sloane Coffin. (Book review.) James Palmer		4
Mechanistic Dynasty, The Downfall of the. Part II. Albert Clarke Wyckoff.		3
Methods of Study in the Greek New Testament, New Ideas and. A. T. Robertson		4
Missionary Work of the Mormons, The. W. M. Paden.....		5
Montgomery, Moravian Hymn Writer, James. John Greenfield.....		3
Mood of Atheism, The. P. Whitwell Wilson.....		20
<i>Moody, D. L.</i> —William R. Moody. (Book review.) Frederick W. Lewis.....		3
Moravian Hymn Writer, James Montgomery. John Greenfield.....		34
Mormons, The Missionary Work of the. W. M. Paden.....		55
Neve, J. L. German Rationalism at Its First Appearance.....		19
New Ideas and Methods of Study in the Greek New Testament. A. T. Robertson		4
New Testament, New Ideas and Methods of Study in the Greek. A. T. Robertson		4
Ockham, The Life, Teaching, and Influence of William of. T. Bruce Birch..		36
Old Testament, Jesus' Use of the. H. E. Dana.....		38
One of the Problems of a Pioneering Institution. James Coffin Stout.....		23
Osborn, Andrew R.:		
Divine Wrath and Human History. (Under Exegetical.).....		9
Present Theological Views. (Under The Review.).....	102,	53
<i>The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity</i> .—John Baillie. (Book review.)		13
Second Corinthians 3:12-4:6. (Under Exegetical.).....		25
Trends in Religious Thought. (Under The Review.).....	254,	42
Isaiah 40:27-31. (Under Exegetical.).....		41

INDEX

639

PAGE

<i>The De Sacramento Altaris of William of Ockham.</i> —Edited by T. Bruce Birch. (Book review.).....	460
The Responsibility of Privilege. (Under Exegetical.).....	574
Karl Barth's Theology. (Book reviews of <i>The Teaching of Karl Barth.</i> —R. Birch Hoyle. <i>The Karl Barth Theology.</i> —Alvin Sylvester Zerbe.)..	620
den, W. M. The Missionary Work of the Mormons.....	553
lmer, James. <i>The Present Crisis in Religion.</i> —W. E. Orchard. (Book review.)	134
<i>The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.</i> —Max Weber. (Book review.)	296
<i>The Meaning of the Cross.</i> —Henry Sloane Coffin. (Book review.).....	462
raclete in Tertullian's Writings, The. R. Birch Hoyle.....	170
ermanent Deposits of Colonialism in American Christianity. Abdel Ross Wentz	536
oneering Institution, One of the Problems of a. James Coffin Stout.....	230
razzini, Agide. <i>The Holy Kabbalah.</i> —A. E. Waite. (Book review.).....	151
<i>The Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization.</i> —George Livingstone Robinson. (Book review.).....	457
ace of Jesus Chirst in Modern Christianity, The.—John Baillie. (Book review.) Andrew R. Osborn.....	138
resent Theological Views. (Under The Review.) Andrew R. Osborn...102,	582
problems of a Country Minister, The. John C. Siler.....	400
rophetic Prospects of the Jews, The.—Patrick Fairbairn. (Book review.) H. W. Magoun.....	309
rotestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, The.—Max Weber. (Book review.) James Palmer.....	296
ychologies of 1930.—Edited by Carl Murchison. (Book review.) Albert Clarke Wyckoff	301
ationalism at Its First Appearance, German. J. L. Neve.....	190
reality in Religion, A Search for. S. D. Chown.....	505
reform Movement in Judaism, The.—David Philipson. (Book review.) Herbert W. Magoun.....	616
reality, A Search for Reality in. S. D. Chown.....	505
religion, <i>The Origin and Growth of.</i> —W. Schmidt. (Book review.) R. W. Albright	630
eligious and Philosophies in the United States of America.—Compiled by Julius A. Weber. (Book review under title, Christian Symbolics.) Robert M. Kurtz.....	477
responsibility of Privilege, The. Andrew R. Osborn. (Under Exegetical.)...	574
evelation, Science and Divine. W. Bell Dawson.....	77
review, The. Present Theological Views. Trends in Religious Thought. Current Thought and Activity. Books.....102, 254, 421,	582
obertson, A. T. New Ideas and Methods of Study in the Greek New Testament	49
<i>Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization, The.</i> —George Livingstone Robinson. (Book review.) Agide Pirazzini.....	457
science and Divine Revelation. W. Bell Dawson.....	77
earch for Reality in Religion, A. S. D. Chown.....	505
second Corinthians 3:12-4:6. (Under Exegetical.) Andrew R. Osborn.....	250
ler, John C. The Problems of a Country Minister.....	400
loan, Harold Paul. A Study of the Biblical Supernatural.....	11

Some Arduous Elements of Christian Experience. (Under Exegetical.)

- Howard Tillman Kuist.....
 Stout, James Coffin. One of the Problems of a Pioneering Institution.....
 Study in the Greek New Testament, New Ideas and Methods of. A. T.
 Robertson
 Study of the Biblical Supernatural, A. Harold Paul Sloan.....
 Supernatural, A Study of the Biblical. Harold Paul Sloan.....
Supreme Book of Mankind, The.—James G. K. McClure. (Book review.)
 Dean G. McKee.....

Tendencies which Limit Faith and Life, Current. Alva J. McClain.....

Tertullian's Writings, The Paraclete in. R. Birch Hoyle.....
 Trends in Religious Thought. (Under The Review.) Andrew R. Osborn..254,

Understand? Do We Really Try to. Herbert W. Magoun.....

Warren, Paul C. *The Decline of the Medieval Church.*—Alexander Clarence
 Flick. (Book review.).....

Wentz, Abdel Ross. Permanent Deposits of Colonialism in American Chris-
 tianity

Who Moved the Stone?—Frank Morison. (Book review.) Albert Clarke
 Wyckoff

Wilson, P. Whitwell. The Mood of Atheism.....
Word Pictures in the New Testament.—Archibald Thomas Robertson. (Book
 review.) Robert M. Kurtz.....

Wyckoff, Albert Clarke. *Foursquare.*—John Rathbone Oliver. (Book review.)
Psychologies for 1930.—Edited by Carl Murchison. (Book review.).....

Who Moved the Stone?—Frank Morison. (Book review.).....
 The Downfall of the Mechanistic Dynasty. Part II.....

What Do We Mean by God?—Cyril H. Valentine. (Book review.).....